FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-126
Thursday
30 June 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-126 *30 June 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Military Industries' Reconversion Viewed *[Menshikov in PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 1
U.S. Reciprocation on Inspections Urged *[Kozyakov]* 2
'Anxiety' Over Soviet Inspectors Decried *[Pogrebnikov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Roundtable on Past, Present Foreign Policy *[Bogomolov, Mendelevich, Molchanov, Prudkov]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Forbade' Soviet Contact With Citizens *[Belov in TRUD 26 Jun]* 10
Indictment of Former CIA Station Chief Noted 10
U.S., Israel To Cooperate on SDI-Related Project 11
Correction to Shishlin Assesses Summit Results 11

China

Alekseyev on 'Identical' Stands With China 11
PRC Relaxes Controls Over Performing Arts *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 12
Fishery Delegation Holds Vladivostok Talks 12
Ni Zhifu Receives Trade Union Delegation 13
Relations With U.S. Communist Party Restored 13
'Friendly Nature' of Ties With Nepal Noted 13

Northeast Asia

Kim Il-song Stops Over En Route to Mongolia 13
PRAVDA on Stopover *[29 Jun]* 13
KCNA Details Visit 13
Greets Party, State Leaders *[Pyongyang KCNA]* 14
Passes Through Border City *[Pyongyang KCNA]* 14
DPRK President Arrives in Ulaanbaatar 28 Jun 15
DPRK-Mongolian Talks Begin 15
Congratulations Cabled to New Mongolian Minister *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 15
Mongolian Political Officers Visit 16-23 Jun *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 16
Ryzhkov Meets With Mitsubishi Chairman 16
Japanese Foreign Minister Stops Over in Moscow *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 16
Moscow Rebuts Takeshita Statement on Policy *[Dmitriyev]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Discusses Current Cambodian Situation *[Korsunov]* 17
Solutions for Cambodian Conflict Viewed *[Mulatov]* 17
CPV Central Committee Plenum Reported *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 18
Interview With SRV Foreign Minister Cited *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]* 18
Station Observer Defends PRK, SRV *[(Osotov)]* 18

Near East & South Asia

Joint Soviet-Afghan News Conference Held 19
Gromov, Chervov on Withdrawal From Afghanistan 20
Kornilov Scores U.S. Stand on Afghan Agreements *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Jun]* 20
International Aid To Free Soviet POW's Urged *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]* 21
Committee on Prisoners in Afganistan Meets 21
Zaykov Meets Kabul City Party Delegation *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 22
Afghan Tribesmen Reject 'Transitional Government' *[PRAVDA 29 Jun]* 22
Turkmenistan Aids in Afghan Water, Book Supplies *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 22

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ghanaian-Soviet Consultations End in Moscow 23
Burkinabe Minister Interviewed on USSR Visit 23
Guinea-Bissau Talks on Angola Reported 24
Commentary Links Namibian Fight, Talks Progress *[Tsolivon]* 24

East Europe

Hungarian-Romanian Dispute Observed 25
Upcoming Grosz Visit in July Previewed 25
Non-Communist Proposed for Hungarian State Post *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 25
Poles Given 'Complete Economic Freedom' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Jun]* 26
Poland's Glemp Views Church-State Relations *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 25]* 27
Briefs 27
Computer Company With Hungary 27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

PRAVDA on Gromyko Award Ceremony Speech *[22 Jun]* 28
Ryzhkov, Talyzin Inspect Goods Exhibition *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 29
Ligachev, Zaykov, Nikonov Visit Georgian Center 30
Zaykov Attends Institute Theses Discussion *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 30
PRAVDA Reports Demichev Award Presentation *[26 Jun]* 30
Solovyev at Launch of Leningrad Housing Plan *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jun]* 31
Tatliyev Addresses Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet *[Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 18 Jun]* 31
Armenian First Secretary Meets Yerevan Citizens *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 12 Jun]* 33
Latvian Resolution Focuses on Nationalism *[Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 19 Jun]* 34
Latvian Writers Union Resolution Published *[Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 11 Jun]* 36
Further on Social Impact of Brezhnev Era *[Bestuzhev-Laaa in NEDELYA No 25]* 39
Investigation Concluded on Brezhnev Son-in-Law *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Jun]* 45
Prosecutor Ponders Immediate Tasks of Justice *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 45
Account of Briefing Held on Stalin's Legacy 49
Fears Voiced for 'Defeat' of Restructuring *[MOSCOW NEWS No 23]* 51
Readers Concerned for Fate of Restructuring *[Orlik in IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]* 56
Militia Censured for Acts Against Demonstrators *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 58
Professor Argues Need for Law on Demonstrations *[TRUD 22 Jun]* 58
Weekly Comments on 'Democratic Union' Rally *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA]* 60

Economic

Gosplan Viewed as Obstructing New Initiatives
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 24 Jun] 63
New Decree Still Taxes Cooperatives Too Much *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 29 Jun]* 64
Standards Committee Criticized Over Poor Quality *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 65

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Embark on Space Walk 66
To Repair X-Ray Telescope 66
Work Completed; Back Aboard 66
Purpose of Walk Noted 66
'Mir' Cosmonauts' Week of Research Described 67
Soviet, Bulgarian Cosmonauts' Success Recognized 68
Gromyko Presents Medals *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]* 68
News Conference Held 69

Military

Yazov Book on Military History Reviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jun]* 69
Military Draft Dodging in Kirghizia Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jun]* 71
Akhromeyev, Others Sign Gorodetskiy Obituary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 71

U.S. Military Industries' Reconversion Viewed

PM2806155588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Professor S. Menshikov: "An Economy Without Weapons: Utopia or Reality?"]

[Text] Recent events, in particular last year's stock market upheaval in the United States, Japan, and other countries, have highlighted the question: How is the capitalist economy to develop in the future? How can new, even more serious upheavals, which experts and forecasters say are likely, be avoided? If one summarizes their pronouncements, one comes up with the following recipes: Eliminate or at least sharply reduce the U.S. state budget deficit; correct the imbalance in international trade and payments; create conditions for financial and currency stability.

But this cannot be achieved without a radical reduction in military expenditure, since that is the main cause of the imbalance. Since the stock market crash, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, pressure has increased on Congress and the White House, with demands for a cut in the Pentagon budget. The British economist Stephen Marris, author of the well-known book "Deficits and the Dollar: The World Economy at Risk," believes that an economic crisis can only be avoided by cutting the U.S. budget deficit by $100 billion in the next 2 years.

There was a time when bourgeois theorists saw nothing bad in the practice of stimulating economic growth by injecting more funds into military budgets and inflating them. The celebrated J.M. Keynes compared arms production to the construction of the Egyptian pyramids: They are both useless in themselves, but, faute de mieux, they increase employment and maintain the social system in conditions of economic crisis and mass unemployment.

But this claim is true only if one ignores alternative, nonmilitary state programs. It has been established for sure that a reduction in unemployment is best obtained by increasing civil rather than military expenditure. In the United States every billion dollars invested in military rather than civil production results in a loss of 6,000 jobs. From 1981 through 1985, the rapid growth of Pentagon expenditure put 1,146,000 people out of work. These are the figures of the "Employment Research Associates" consultancy firm. Many other reliable authors in the United States, in the FRG, and in other countries have produced similar figures.

Present-day proponents of the arms race are resorting to different arguments. According to them, military production is a necessary evil, but every cloud has a silver lining: It has a positive effect, stimulating the invention of civil goods. Let us listen, for example, to Geoffrey Pattie, former British secretary of state for trade and industry: "Of course, SDI is a military research program with definite objectives. But it will be followed by inventions and discoveries which could profoundly alter the lifestyle and aspirations of mankind. It is not pie in the sky, but real programs which will raise the living standards of the world community." Other apologists (what else can you call them?) refer to examples from World War II: the invention of radar, the development of jet aircraft, and the appearance of the first computers. What objections could there be? Plenty.

U.S. economist Lloyd Jeffrey Dumas published a book called "The Overburdened Economy," which is a careful analysis of this question. He does not deny the benefits of some military discoveries to the civil sector. But he cites numerous drawbacks: the removal of material and financial resources, scientists, and technical experts from the civil sphere. The overall balance is negative, and Dumas concludes that the military sector is a parasite living at the expense of other economic means.

Among the capitalist countries, Japan has had the highest rates of technical progress and production growth in recent decades. And it has the lowest military expenditure relative to the national product. Its antithesis is the United States, whose militarism, it is commonly acknowledged, has undermined the economy's competitiveness and inhibited the improvement of productivity. U.S. economic Simon Ramo writes in his book "America's Technology Slip": "If all the dollars invested in the past 30 years in military research had been spent in those areas of science that are the most promising in terms of economic progress, in all likelihood we would now be at the level that technology will reach in 20 years' time."

In the past, some Marxists have asserted that capitalism cannot do without an arms race and that current production growth is maintained predominantly by military expenditure. But that is an exaggeration. In the postwar years, military expenditure did not exceed 14 percent of the national product in the main capitalist countries; in the United States it is now 7 percent. The chief areas of production growth have been consumer goods, equipment, and construction. But can capitalism do without this 7 percent? Japanese practice (1 percent for military needs) shows that it is possible. Not an easy matter.

From the viewpoint of the theory of marketing the social product, elaborated by K. Marx and V.I Lenin, the military market is not absolutely necessary. But the idea that without military orders capitalism cannot solve the markets problem is still trotted out in books and articles. Isn't it time to take a new look at the issue?

Why has arms production become a permanent element of the modern capitalist economy? Primarily because in the era of imperialism and the general crisis, capitalism gave birth to militarism, essential to the maintenance of class domination and foreign expansion. In this connection, particularly favorable conditions, attractive to capital, were created in the military industry: Higher profits, guaranteed sales, various concessions and indirect subsidies—what Lenin called "legalized embezzlement."

Before World War II, apart from certain prewar and war periods, the arms market was not markedly stable. Only since the forties in the United States, and then in a number of other countries, have major, increasing military orders been a common phenomenon as a consequence of the cold war atmosphere and so-called local wars (Korea, Vietnam). This was the breeding ground for permanently operating specialized military concerns which joined forces with the militarist elite and formed military-industrial complexes. Among the monopoly bourgeoisie, there appeared an influential grouping for whom expanded arms production was an aim in itself.

Thus, the question of adaptation to an economy without weapons actually comes out as follows: Is it possible within the framework of modern capitalism to limit and gradually reduce to a minimum the power and influence of the military-industrial complex? Many representatives of progressive circles consider this form of the question to be perfectly valid. But what is the position of the capitalist circles on which adaptation depends to a considerable degree?

Big capital is not united on this one. The military-industrial concerns are strong, but they are a minority because the monopoly bourgeoisie gets its chief profits from civil production. It is through the military budget that surplus value is redistributed to the benefit of military firms, to the displeasure of civil firms. The growth of military expenditure brought about a reduction in the overall rate of economic growth and intensified the structural crisis in the base sectors, not to mention the impact on the financial-credit and currency spheres. All this is causing many representatives of the ruling circles to back the demand to limit the arms race.

In response one hears complaints about the difficulties, the impossibility even of reconversion, that is, switching military production to civil production. As liberal U.S. economist Seymour Melman writes, the Pentagon has resolutely objected to legislation compelling the administration to elaborate reconversion plans. Opponents of the plans cite the argument that the market mechanism will take care of everything. Melman himself believes that the market cannot take such a switch, since mass dismissals of workers could follow.

But the reconversion difficulties should not be exaggerated. The press reports that, foreseeing a possible slump in military budgets, the arms producers themselves are diversifying, trying to buy up civil firms, particularly in the high technology sphere, where the profit norms are no lower and are sometimes higher than in arms production. This applies in particular to concerns which hitherto have been producing nuclear warhead delivery vehicles, missiles, and bombers. Of course, these concerns would like to continue producing B-1B and MX missiles, but the feeling is that the market is saturated and is not too reliable politically.

Many researchers stress that with rare exceptions the production apparatus of modern industry is akin to the civil apparatus. Switching from one to the other does not present technical difficulties. It is easiest of all for the very big concerns which possess considerable maneuverability and financial reserves. Switching is more difficult for small firms (there are more than 150,000 in the United States) which, as subcontractors, have tied their futures to the Pentagon's main suppliers. In this case, reconversion plans are de rigueur.

The plans could take into account the potential for an increase in consumer goods, state contracts for civil construction, and the expansion of trade with socialist and developing countries. By making full use of modern equipment and technology to make consumer goods production cheaper and not to create new types of weapons, it is possible to achieve a considerable increase in consumer purchasing power and improve the general economic situation. The new markets would not be as privileged, but I believe that, by and large, they would be no less profitable than the notorious "revolving doors" system in which the interests of the military concerns and the militarists merge.

But it would be fanciful to expect the military-industrial complex to give in without a fight. Military concerns are diversifying, but they are also elaborating new plans for the production of alternative types of weapons that are not subject to cuts. The biggest hopes are pinned on SDI, which promises in the future to provide contracts (in different versions) worth between $150 billion to $770 billion.

There have been various reports in the press about plans for the production of a military spacecraft (a joint Pentagon and NASA order) and an ultra-accurate cruise missile and on other new types of improved conventional weapons just as destructive as nuclear weapons. Increasing pressure is being put on Japan and the West European countries to increase military production. The international arms trade, which approaches $30 billion a year, is being amplified by U.S. and other military concerns' hasty steps to open up branches in developing countries and by the transfer of patents to them for the production of armaments.

The military-industrial complex is active and flexible, and it is making its own arrangements to adapt to the prospect of a nuclear-free world. So, aside from arms reduction measures, mounting efforts are needed in the struggle to push back and curb the military-industrial complex. Capitalism cannot be expected to adapt automatically to a world without weapons.

U.S. Reciprocation on Inspections Urged

LD3006023888 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Soviet and American delegations in Geneva have reportedly exchanged information about underground nuclear testing in their countries. Here is comment by Vladislav Kozyakov:

The two sides, he writes, have supplied detailed information about five tests and agreed on mutual inspections by experts of the nuclear test sites in Nevada and Semipalatinsk. Experimental explosions to be held at the two sites in August are intended to help Soviet and American experts clarify verification. This report is a reminder that where there is a mutual wish, agreement can be reached on largescale verification of disarmament moves. An even more striking indication of this truth is the INF Treaty. This treaty provides for a total of 640 on-site inspections. What all future arms control agreements need is openness and a readiness for any kind of inspection.

The Soviet Union has made it a practice to invite the other side's experts to gain first-hand information to remove any doubts where security is concerned. When the United States had doubts about the INF Treaty, its representatives were invited to visit facilities near Moscow and Gomel. Americans were also invited to the radar station at Krasnoyarsk to see for themselves that the Soviet Union has been abiding by all the treaty commitments. It would be fair if the American side did the same; but it has not yet invited Soviet experts to any of the radars that cause concern here. And now, too, when an agreement is being hammered out to slash strategic offensive arms, there is no sign of reciprocity. The United States does not wish its warships or submarines to be inspected.

The Soviet Union has also suggested exchanging information about conventional arms and armed forces in Europe and monitoring them with on-site inspections, but there has been no reply. And yet, to show no readiness for disarmament control of any kind means jeopardizing any arms reduction.

'Anxiety' Over Soviet Inspectors Decried

PM2906104188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 88 Single Edition p 8

[Colonel V. Pogrebnikov "Rejoinder": "Missiles and Secrets"]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been "working" for nearly a month now. Over this time the sides, as was envisaged, have exchanged updated data on their status as of 1 June—the date the treaty enters into force—and are ready to begin on-site inspections.

It is not out of the question that during inspections, various problems may arise for each side. No great matter can do without these problems, especially a matter like the elimination of a whole class of weapons: over 2,500 intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. But some people are deliberately and artificially creating problems.

Thus, even before the start of on-site inspections, the U.S. journal U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT began to regale readers with views of a highly dubious nature. Calling our inspectors, whose arrival is expected 1 July, "a group of qualified Soviet agents," the journal demands: "The United States must secure itself against the Soviet verifiers learning more than envisaged by the treaty."

What grounds are there for this anxiety? The following: In the past 4 months, the Pentagon has carried out three dozen special exercises. Taking part were 200 inspectors who are to travel to the Soviet Union and 400 staffers called on to escort the Soviet inspectors on U.S. territory. The journal writes that during an exercise the "Soviet" representatives—their parts were played by Russian-speaking U.S. inspectors—were able to elude their escorts' control for an hour. During another exercise, a "Soviet" inspector was able to gain access to secret information. During yet another exercise on the way to a verification site, a "Soviet" group was led through top secret military zones, access to which is not authorized for the Soviets.

Nor is that all, the journal continues. We must not allow "even physical contact between the inspectors and secret materials, especially materials like cover for modern weapons systems." Unless the inspectors have gloves on, the Soviets will be able to collect intellilence with the aid of... their finger nails.

Vigilance is useful and necessary. But the "supervigilance" which U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT urges is based on a kind of "presumption of guilt" of the Soviet inspectors. Spy mania, the attempt to place a mine of distrust under the verification of the fulfillment of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, does this journal no credit.

Roundtable on Past, Present Foreign Policy

PM2906145088 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 88 p 14

[Unattributed abridged account of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Press Club session attended by Academician Oleg Bogomolov, director of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System; Ambassador Lev Mendelevich, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Evaluation and Planning Administration; Professor Nikolay Molchanov; and foreign journalists, and chaired by Oleg Prudkov: "From Balance of Forces to Balance of Interests"—date of Press Club session not given]

[Text] The latest LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Press Club session discussed the last, 10th item in the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th party conference, which evaluates the situation in the world and formulates Soviet foreign policy objectives.

Taking part in the discussion were Academician Oleg Bogomolov, director of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System; Ambassador Lev Mendelevich, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Evaluation and Planning Administration; and Professor Nikolay Molchanov; as well as journalists accredited to the USSR: Gao Fenyi (RENMIN RIBAO, China), Giulietto Chiesa (L'UNITA, Italy), Yoshisuke Niidzuma (ASAHI, Japan), Michael Parks (LOS ANGELES TIMES, United States), Martin Walker (THE GUARDIAN, Britain), and Scott Shane (BALTIMORE SUN, United States).

Oleg Prudkov, member of the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editorial collegium, conducted the meeting.

O. Prudkov: In thinking about the future, we evaluate critically the past and present. For many years, foreign policy was a no-go area for criticism. We often passed off wishes as reality, being guided by the old scenarios in our political constructs. We became involved in a costly arms race and regional conflicts. Our foreign policy was of a high-cost nature. It failed to keep pace with the patent changes that had taken place in the world.

I would like to draw the participants' attention to certain specific issues. In my view, the Theses do not say enough about the problems of Europe. Yet the development of Soviet-American relations and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles have created in effect a new situation in Europe. And they have given rise to many questions to which answers must be sought. Another problem is the role of the Soviet military-industrial complex. The Theses say that the state's security will increasingly be ensured not by military but political means.

O. Bogomolov: The first results of restructuring testify that we exercise our main foreign policy influence precisely through successes in internal affairs. The effectiveness of the USSR's foreign policy today should perhaps be measured least of all in terms of the activeness and art of our diplomats. Every major success in the cause of the democratization of society and the implementation of radical economic transformations is a most effective contribution to foreign policy. In international life, the emphasis on strong-arm tactics and military-political pressure is giving way to decisions founded on the balance of interests. Hence the new means of achieving foreign policy goals—not the buildup of military spending, but the growth of economic, scientific, and technical potential, the heightening of the moral prestige of policy, and the strengthening of trust in the leadership's actions.

I think the economic evaluation of foreign policy should come to the fore. The task of foreign policy is not only to ensure the country's security, but also to facilitate its socioeconomic progress. Whether foreign policy helps to save resources for productive utilization—that is one of the main criteria in evaluating it.

G. Chiesa: I see in the Theses a very important, self-critical, innovative analysis of the situation in the most diverse spheres. At the same time, I see that the international section of the Theses is not so much a discussion document as the other sections, where there is much that is not finally determined and is open to discussion. Here the formulations are very specific, as if everything was already decided. I wonder: To what extent do the differences and the political struggle that exist in the internal affairs of restructuring extend to foreign policy?

I am afraid that during the debates at the 19th party conference, foreign policy problems will be left rather to one side. But, on the contrary, it would be very important to extend the debate on these issues—the most important issues, in my view, for the renewal of Soviet society. I understood from Nina Andreyeva's letter (and as we know, the letter reflects by no means only her personal opinion) that the letter's main idea is to keep the Soviet Union closed. Of course, the letter is discussing restructuring, but the Soviet Union's foreign and domestic policy have never before been as closely linked as they are now.

L. Mendelevich: First, I would like to come back to our chairman's remarks and say that as a professional diplomat, I naturally agree with his evaluation of our foreign policy activity in the past. This just criticism is also present in the Theses. But for the sake of truth, it should be added that it would be incorrect simply to cross out the whole of our past foreign policy and speak of it only in negative terms. The fact is that there were indeed periods of foreign policy stagnation, but there were also, sometimes despite the general stagnation within the country, periods of significant, fruitful activity under the influence of powerful, long-term foreign policy factors. I have in mind, first and foremost, the 20th congress. It was during those years, the sixties, and in part the seventies, that exceptionally important international treaties on limiting the arms race were concluded on our initiative. It was during that period that relations in Europe were to some extent normalized on a sound

political basis as a result of the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty with the FRG and other treaties between the socialist countries and the FRG, and later the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe with its Final Act in 1975.

At the same time, it is true that the second half of the seventies was characterized by a decline in activeness. And in the first half of the eighties, stagnation fully embraced the foreign policy sphere, too.

The question now arises: Fine, after the April 1985 plenum everything began to move in our country, but if in the sphere of the economy, ideology, economic management, and state building, restructuring is proceeding through struggle, overcoming resistance, then can it really be the case that in the sphere of foreign policy it meets with no resistance and proceeds smoothly? I would not, of course, make that claim. The first opponent of restructuring was our own ossified thinking, over a period at least of decades we had grown used to thinking: All the same, nothing will come of it.... Before we could begin to think in a new way, we had to adjust ourselves to it. In the Foreign Ministry, there were enough people who knew how to set the cause of restructuring in motion, overcoming their own inertia.

And what about the other strata, the other components of the Soviet establishment involved with foreign policy? Did they and do they have to overcome resistance there? Do problems arise there? Of course. I was in Washington and New York in April, and the Americans asked me: "What role do your military play in the formation of the new foreign policy? Do they agree with it?" I answered frankly: Naturally, military men think, first and foremost, about the maximum possible means of ensuring security. But restructuring is taking place in their consciousness, too. Therefore, I can say quite definitely: On all the major questions of foreign policy to the extent that it touches on military policy, and on all questions of military policy to the extent that it influences foreign policy, we invariably, if not always immediately, find a common language with the military.

In our country, there is no split between diplomacy and what they call the military-industrial complex. Although disputes, debates, and heated discussions occur. But we probably do not experience any retarding or, still less, any blocking influence from any state or party organs. Probably not.

O. Bogomolov: But does it not seem to you that the Foreign Ministry still has a monopoly on the expression of views and the exposition of approaches? And that in general it is not very inclined to allow the public and the scientific public to take part in the debates or to listen to other opinions and take them into account? Is it perhaps only from the tall building on Smolenskaya Square that everything appears to be running smoothly and calmly? While in fact all around there is a sea of life, views, approaches. It must be admitted that the broad public is not involved in the examination of foreign policy questions; they are not discussed seriously even by the Supreme Soviet commissions.

L. Mendelevich: A rather closed nature is characteristic of any diplomatic service. I would not want to minimize it, but I would not want to exaggerate it either. I would not exaggerate it because, apart from the Foreign Ministry, there are a whole series of state and party institutions that are concerned with foreign policy issues and are our partners, and at the same time our critics—they are the relevant departments of the party Central Committee and certain other institutions, including the Defense Ministry, which is involved almost as closely with foreign policy as with military policy. Thus, to say that we live in total isolation is incorrect and unjustified, especially since we have now established broad and close ties with scientists, too.

But I agree that in our country foreign policy issues have not yet fully become the subject of public and social discussion. That includes parliamentary discussion—which should be the starting point.

Y. Niidzuma: According to the theses, the USSR's foreign policy should be based on the new thinking, glasnost, and openness. In this connection, I have two questions. The first is about Afghanistan: Many people doubt the correctness of the decision to send Soviet troops into Afghanistan at the end of 1979. But the USSR leadership has to this day not said whether it considers that action correct and justified. Why not publish the documents connected with the sending of Soviet troops into Afghanistan?

And the second question: about the SS-20 missiles. I am entirely in agreement with the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in accordance with the USSR-U.S. treaty. But again: Is it not possible to find out how the decision to station SS-20's in the USSR and the ally countries was taken?

L. Mendelevich: The publication of documents concerning the adoption of important decisions is a very complex and delicate field. You will not find such publications, not only here in the USSR, but in the vast majority of other states, including Japan. Archives are opened only after many years. If states were to do otherwise, then probably they would simply have no foreign policy. The Soviet Union is no different from other states in this respect.

N. Molchanov: I am convinced that the decision to send troops into Afghanistan, however it was justified, was a serious mistake. That is my personal opinion. I do not know what people at the Foreign Ministry think about it, whether or not it is time to admit it, or what impression it would make, at least on part of the limited contingent. The sooner the truth is admitted, the better, in my view.

Now, to another subject: the statement that after the 20th CPSU Congress our foreign policy entered a period of constructive activity. I do not agree with that assertion. Of course, treaties and agreements were concluded whose positive significance is beyond doubt. But there were other things, too. There was 1956, the tragic events in Hungary, which have not been fully explained or uncovered to this day. Their effect on the world is not yet clear, but we must clarify it, or else we cannot achieve restructuring in international relations. And another thing. If you are talking about policy after the 20th congress, that means Khrushchev's policy. I would say it was generally based on utopian, adventurist foundations. Remember Nikita Sergeyevich's expressions "we will bury you," "we'll teach you a lesson"—even non-Russians know all these expressions well. I see nothing constructive about that. And what about the "strategic course" of catching up and overtaking America?

In order to ensure restructuring in international relations, we need openness in the sphere of foreign policy, which has hitherto been a closed, prohibited field. We are still guided solely by official formulations in writing about foreign policy. We are thereby deceiving ourselves, our own people, and the world around us. We must stop it.

This summer the 10th-grade students will not sit graduation examinations on the history of the USSR. It turns out that our history, our domestic policy, has been so complex, if not for the whole 70 years, at least for the last 50, that 16-year-olds are not now capable of interpreting or understanding it. Yet foreign and domestic policy are a single whole; we separate them only for theoretical or administrative bureaucratic purposes. So what does this mean? In the postwar period, our domestic policy was so bad, so terrible that you cannot say anything straightforward about it, even to schoolchildren, yet our foreign policy was ideal, judging by the works, textbooks, and reference books that are still in force.

Where did Lenin begin when he embarked on foreign policy activity as head of government? By declaring the need to eradicate secret diplomacy and publish all treaties. Of course, secret diplomacy cannot be eliminated, say, in the process of talks—you cannot put your cards on the table beforehand. But politically, this Leninist line must be revived.

To this day the predominant element in our approach to international affairs (and, incidentally, in the approach of Western commentators) is the method of reduction, that is, simplification and schematization of the subject and of the intellectual technique, whereby for the sake of clarity, highly complex situations are oversimplified. We oversimplified and continue to oversimplify international affairs by reducing the extreme complexity of particular situations and problems to some officially approved, guaranteed, indisputable, but meaningless formula. Hence the appearance of unity in foreign policy.

L. Mendelevich: I had the opportunity to observe N.S. Khrushchev's foreign policy activity quite closely. He was a very contradictory man—I think Professor Molchanov will agree with me. You cannot, it is not right to speak only ill of that statesman. He did much that was important, positive, and good, some of it in foreign policy.

O. Bogomolov: The turn to peaceful coexistence...

L. Mendelevich: Of course! He proclaimed and upheld that course. And his fall was connected not only with questions of domestic policy. He came up against opposition on a wide front of problems.

But he also made mistakes in foreign policy and committed ill-considered, short-sighted acts. N.S. Khrushchev was a contradictory man. I think we will all agree on that.

O. Prudkov: This is not the first time a new thinking has come to mankind. We talk today of a revolution, of a revolutionary transformation. Revolutionary transformations have always generated new thinking. Take the ideas of the French bourgeois revolution. Or, for instance, the ideas of Christianity. For its time, Christianity, too, was a new way of thinking.

N. Molchanov: Christianity gave us the idea of God incarnate. The idea found acceptance, perhaps too much acceptance...

O. Bogomolov: I want to dwell on one topic which, I think, will be a subject of discussion both here and abroad. I am talking about the principle of defense sufficiency, which is reflected both in the Theses and in recent speeches by the Soviet leadership. I find it hard to combine it with the principle of military-strategic parity with the United States and the principle of equality of arms between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The Theses say that in seeking military-strategic parity, we became drawn into the arms race, which is, on the whole, beyond the powers of our economy. There have indeed been times when we were in the midst of a ring of unfriendly, opposing states: NATO in the West, China and Japan in the East, and in the South simply a military hotbed, as well as unfriendly countries. That is a great foreign policy failure, because probably no other country in the world has found itself so "brilliantly" surrounded as a result of its actions or inaction. This confrontation made us build up our military potential. Seeking parity, we placed an intolerable burden on our economy. By my calculations, the combined national income of all the Warsaw Pact countries is approximately two-fifths of the combined national income of the NATO countries. Let us assume we achieve an equal defense result for equal expenditure—although I am not sure of that (yes, we have cheap manpower, but the nucleus of modern armaments—electronics—costs us many times more than other countries). Nonetheless, let us assume equal results for equal expenditure. But even that means that the

burden on the national income is 250 percent greater for us. The United States spends approximately 6 percent of its national income on defense and the European countries 3 percent or more. If you take these figures, it turns out that the burden on our national income is around 10-15 percent. Perhaps that figure could be made more precise in future. In any case, it is unprecedented expenditure. Of course, this takes place at the cost of reducing all domestic consumption in the country to a minimum. We probably have millions of people who can hardly make ends meet. So the cost approach in foreign policy is by no means an abstract problem, it is a vital issue for millions of people.

It worries me that even now, the formula of "defense sufficiency," contained in the Theses, is interpreted as achieving parity at a lower level. But even if we halve our military spending and achieve a figure of 5-8 percent of national income—it will still be a colossal burden for our economy, which will not allow us to breathe and will condemn us to continued laggardness.

N. Molchanov: Why do countries, straining every muscle and draining their economies, strive all the same to have gigantic military might? I think the concept of the great power influences the consciousness of both the government and the public. What was a great power in the 18th century, when the concept was formulated? It was a country that was capable alone, single-handed, of winning a war with the strongest other country. The strongest in the world. That concept came down through the centuries and persists to this day.

After World War II, for a time the idea that a great power must necessarily have nuclear weapons prevailed. General de Gaulle was working on this basis when he sought to create French nuclear weapons. Now everything has changed radically. Now it is not nuclear weapons that make you a great power but economic prosperity, the level of culture, the education system, health care, the living standard. When we define a state's influence, what should predominate is not military might but entirely different indicators. Formerly economic might was measured in tonnes of coal, oil, iron, and steel. That is obsolete now. Today the indicator is information and the technological level. Another indicator is the number of diplomas, high quality ones, of course—the quantity of "gray matter." That is the standard of the future. But for the present, the old idea prevails, that it is great might that makes a great power....

L. Mendelevich: The desire for greatness is still not the whole truth. This approach contains a kernel of rationality, but it is one-sided. There is another reality too: A state must be ready to defend itself. If you think we have no potential enemies who constitute a threat to our security—that is one thing, then your conclusion is correct. But I cannot agree with that, I think that for many decades our security was, and still is, under a certain threat. We must always plan for the worst-case scenario.

Therefore, there cannot, unfortunately, be any other approach. The Theses also say: We do not leave out of the reckoning the militarist danger inherent in the nature of imperialism. That is not propaganda; it is an accurate definition. It is not a matter of insulting anyone; it is an accurate evaluation of reality. There is no escaping it.

What is defense sufficiency in nuclear conditions? It is the preservation of second-strike capabilities in all circumstances. In that case, nuclear war is impossible, as M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan have stated.

Is it possible to lower that level? Yes, it is possible and necessary. By when? A group of our scientists, headed by Academician Sagdeyev, came to the conclusion that it is possible to reduce offensive arms by 95 percent while preserving strategic equilibrium and deterrence. After that, the question of deterrence disappears entirely.

So we are in favor of a 100-percent reduction by the year 2000, but not unilaterally. Since we cannot achieve everything we want immediately, our creed today is defense sufficiency. But you will not find in the Theses or anywhere else the idea that defense sufficiency is interpreted as parity at lower levels—only as equal security at lower levels. We do not need formal parity; we need reliable security.

G. Chiesa: The Soviet Union has now gone further than the majority of West European countries in the sphere of the new thinking. They have accumulated so much distrust that seemingly they do not have much hope of changes for the better. They are watching the Soviet Union carefully, but they themselves are not yet ready to advance rapidly in the sphere of new relationships.

Thus far we have mainly discussed nuclear weapons, but I would like to speak about conventional arms. Here, unfortunately, the same logic operated as in the sphere of strategic arms: to arm more and more, even when there is no need. I think it should now be the responsibility of the present Soviet leadership not only to put forward new proposals but to put forward proposals that will outweigh the Western partners' distrust. I see scope here for very bold, broad initiatives on your part based on the philosophy reflected in the theses.

Ambassador Mendelevich spoke of the threat. Without doubt, there have been threats on both sides. There have been tense moments, and everyone wanted to ensure his own security and defend himself in his own way. But let us look at present-day European realities. What do we see? Is there really a danger of attack from the West against the Eastern part of Europe? I think it is clear that in the present strategic conditions, that danger is highly improbable. At present, much is held up in practice by the problem of distrust. It is necessary to proceed from that premise in analyzing questions of conventional arms reduction in Europe. The Soviet Union could make major unilateral decisions in this sphere. I am not, of course, proposing total unilateral disarmament—by no

means. But some steps in this direction could have a great effect both on the leaders of West European countries and on public opinion, and could help them to adapt to the new thinking, and without detriment to the security of the USSR and its allies.

O. Bogomolov: The degree of threat should on each occasion be analyzed by specialists with a consideration for a multiplicity of factors. It is hard for me to assess the military situation in Europe, but I should like to mention something else in this connection.

We spent a very long time talking about the unvarying nature of imperialism and about the military threat emanating from it. The Theses now note that we do not discount the militarist danger contained in the nature of imperialism.

Of course, we know many examples of major Western powers demonstrating aggressiveness with regard to small countries; we can see the military pressure in the Persian Gulf, and so forth. Nonetheless, the thesis of the unvarying nature of imperialism is somehow not very dialectic. Because everything develops, and, in particular, the situation in Europe today is absolutely different from what it was on the eve of World War II. The Western countries' economic base is also changing. Today the process of interweaving, of interdependence, has, thanks to the activity of the multinational corporations, acquired utterly different dimensions and gone so far that any major military clash becomes increasingly less likely.

So even on the theoretical plane, the question of the threat and the degree of threat must be compared with the realities. More realism, more correlation between political decisions and the real state of affairs, and not some theoretical ideas and schemes inherited from almost as far back as the last century. [sentence as published]

About the idea of unilateral disarmament. We have made such steps in the past, on limited scales, it is true. For instance, we reduced the number of our troops in the GDR. I do not rule out the possibility of new steps of this kind. It seems to me that this would really consolidate the atmosphere of trust and would help lead talks on European problems out of deadlock.

Gao Fenyi: Could Academician Bogomolov not say a few words about the principles on which the Soviet Union intends henceforth to build its relations with the socialist countries? To this day, some unclear points remain. For instance, at news conferences we constantly ask about the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968. As far as I know, the opinions of Soviet scholars and specialists differ.

O. Bogomolov: In the past, relations in the socialist world were often built on the basis of the principle of poorly understood democratic centralism, when emphasis was placed on centralism to the detriment of democracy. Relations of this kind have certain historical justifications: The Soviet Union's experience and its high prestige as a result of the victory over fascism influenced the choice made by other countries. They copied many Soviet decisions and indeed copied the Stalinist model that existed at the time. Hence the excesses. After all, we were also eager for our experience to be copied, and the slightest deviation generated conflicts—you only have to recall the events connected with Yugoslavia in 1948.

We now assert that no one has a monopoly on the truth, each country seeks the best solutions, and we must not impose our experience on each other but learn from each other's experience.

It seems to me that henceforth the kind of actions or the kind of policy which used to be interpreted by the Western press as the "doctrine of limited sovereignty" will become impossible.

As for the Czechoslovak events, this is a matter for the Czechoslovak party and society—assessing the events of 1968 and making amendments to these assessments. I would not like us to have debates on this subject.

M. Parks: One problem—for Americans at any rate—consists in the fact that they do not understand how foreign policy decisions are taken in the Soviet Union. What motives dictate particular decisions? Why do you do what you do? I think that taking a sideways look at yourselves would be useful, including for the consolidation of mutual trust.

L. Mendelevich: You are bringing our discussion back to the beginning when all of us, including myself, expressed ourselves in favor of open debates in the foreign policy field. We also agree that in your country, in the United States, these debates are more vigorous and open. In April, I was in Washington, where I was invited to speak at an open forum at the State Department—this is a general meeting of staffers, for anyone who wants to come. And for an hour, I had the opportunity to speak and to answer questions and to put my opinion of Soviet-U.S. relations completely freely. I assessed this openness very highly, and it has also been assessed in our country, in Moscow.

I told the American diplomats that I had long known four words. The first word is partner. We, our two countries, have the opportunity to be partners on many international and bilateral issues—to our advantage and the advantage of the world as a whole.

The second word is opponent. We have differences on many questions. It is important only that we treat this calmly. The third word is adversary. History, unfortunately, sometimes pushes us into situations where we

become adversaries. The most important thing is, first, to do everything to avoid, to consciously avoid, such situations. Second, if we have ended up as adversaries at some point, that the leaders and peoples should keep a cool head.

There is a fourth word which I have known for many years: enemy. History has forbidden us to be enemies. We must never be so: we have no reason to be enemies. We have differences, we can have conflict situations, but we have no reasons for enmity. We are not your enemies, and we know that your people are not hostile toward us. Unfortunately, your country sometimes tries to present us in the role of enemies. That is a mistake. We are not your enemies.

If we are speaking of the procedure for taking our decisions, it is the same as in America. Either the impetus to prepare proposals comes from above, or some initiative is born from below and is reported higher up.... Then the government or administration takes a decision—that is all; there is nothing mysterious.

M. Walker: You now agree that the international atmosphere has improved. But different reasons are perceived. You in Moscow believe that the atmosphere has improved thanks to your new thinking. Both President Reagan and Mrs Thatcher see a contribution from the West here: It has proved that it is richer and stronger, that it has won the arms race. They see that the Soviet Union is retreating and withdrawing troops from Afghanistan, that it is possibly losing influence in Nicaragua, and that the Cubans will leave Angola. And then perhaps Hungary, perhaps Poland... In my opinion, in both Washington and London, there are people to whom it seems that a new opportunity has appeared for "overthrowing" socialism. And that is dangerous.

L. Mendelevich: I long ago drew attention to one feature of the intelligent and developed representatives of the West European countries' establishment: They are inclined to view socialism in East Europe as something temporary. The Soviet Union will withdraw its troops at some time—and there will be no socialism. West European statesmen and politicians do not have the political courage to understand that the development of socialism in East Europe is a historical process and that they must take into account the will of the people and the right to choose.

Will our troops always be in Hungary? I do not think so. We will reduce our armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe and then reduce them again, and the situation will become completely different. But socialism will remain socialism. The analogy with Afghanistan and Angola is absolutely inappropriate.

A few more words about Europe. The thesis has developed here that the West European countries do not threaten us. I also think that there is no threat to us from, for example, Luxembourg, Denmark, or Norway. They do not intend to attack the Soviet Union, but unfortunately, even these three states are members of a military-political alliance. An alliance which also includes two non-European powers, one of which has colossal military might. And a considerable proportion of this might is concentrated in Europe.

Thousands of various reasons could cause war and by no means the desire of the President or the general secretary to destroy the Soviet Union or America. The syndrome of despair, confused priorities, a technical or human error... A war could begin, although neither the U.S. Administration nor the Soviet leadership has deliberately begun it. The threat lies in the armaments themselves, and in distrust. One feeds the other.

O. Prudkov: How to safeguard the world against this threat? The decisions of the 19th party conference should prompt answers to a question of such importance.

United States & Canada

U.S. 'Forbade' Soviet Contact With Citizens

PM2806152588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Jun 88 p 3

[I. Belov article: "Giving With One Hand..."]

[Text] As reported earlier, G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the Information Department, spoke at a briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center about discrimination against members of a Soviet tourist group which visited the United States in the first half of June. Under threat of expelling them from the country before the trip ended, State Department officials forbade the Soviet people to meet and speak to ordinary Americans. A TRUD correspondent has asked three of the Transatlantic tourist trip participants to give their views of the U.S. authorities' attempts to hamper the development of contacts between Soviet and American working people. Now over to them:

Aleksey Beschastnov, driver at the Moscow Main Administration for Motor Transport's No 3 motor combine:

I did not just want to see the sights of New York, Chicago, and Washington in America. I also wanted to visit an ordinary American family, to see how they live, and to hear what they think about us. Such an opportunity almost arose in San Francisco. I and many members of the group were invited by some elderly Americans who had recently visited the USSR as tourists to visit their homes. However, on the eve of the planned meetings, our guides insistently advised us to decline the invitations, referring to instructions "from above," evidently from the State Department. Otherwise, they warned us, there might be a lot of trouble. I will never forget the expression on the faces of our new friends when they heard that they would not be able to receive the Soviet people in their homes. Some were unable to hold back tears, sorry that normal human contact was not possible, and ashamed of their government's actions.

On the whole, I gained the impression that ordinary Americans are extremely interested in all aspects of Soviet reality, and also that they are very communicative, make contact easily, and freely express their views. On our flight back to Moscow, we traveled with U.S. sportsmen who were part of a wrestling team. For several hours, they virtually showered us with questions about life in the Soviet Union, politics, and ecological questions. It is still absolutely incomprehensible to me why certain influential people in the United States are against free communication between our countries' peoples.

Pavel Sturov, modeler at the "Likhachev" Motor Vehicle Plant:

I would like to say a few words about the guides who accompanied us. In Chicago, for instance, we were looked after by a certain Edward Pustilnik, who had emigrated from the Soviet Union earlier. He did his utmost to describe the delights of the American way of life. He even went as far as to engage in considerations about the quickest way to get out of the Soviet Union. The guides in the other cities also behaved very strangely. The information they gave us was mostly about the cost of this or that building, about car prices, and so forth. So all we learned was mainly about money. This, naturally, could not satisfy our interest in the country, its mores and customs, its achievements and problems. It was, therefore, all the more annoying that our meetings with ordinary Americans, from whom we could have learned about the country and its people, were thwarted.

Emiliya Mironova, leading specialist at an intersector optical microsurgery scientific and technical complex:

Literally a week before our U.S. trip, I read in one of the newspapers something that President Reagan had said on the eve of his official visit to the Soviet Union. "We all believe," he said, "that people must be able to communicate freely with each other, whether they be journalists, scientific workers, scientists, tourists, or students." You can imagine my amazement when my request to visit a clinic in San Francisco to talk to colleagues in my profession was declined. I managed, nonetheless, to talk briefly to individual U.S. medics. I came away from these conversations convinced that they are quite well informed about our institute, that they know of S. Fedorov, its director general, and that they hope to come to Soviet Union to see our work for themselves.

...Clearly, the unceremonious interference by State Department officials in human contacts between people continues despite the considerable recent improvement in USSR-U.S. relations. It is evidence of a relapse into the old "sickness" engendered by the notorious cold war times. It is to be hoped, nonetheless, that the new thinking will gain the upper hand and that the U.S. side will discharge its obligations to expand the exchange of ideas and information more consistently. After all, the current U.S. President has spoken about this more than once. Maybe the White House incumbent who is so fond of Russian proverbs should try to grasp another one: "Giving with one hand, while taking away with the other."

Indictment of Former CIA Station Chief Noted

LD2906175488 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 29 TASS—Joseph F. Fernandez, the former station chief of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency in Costa Rica and one of the participants in the undercover operations of the White House to supply arms to Iran and to transfer some proceeds to the Nicaraguan contras, was brought to trial in the USA. He

was arraigned on a five-count indictment charging conspiracy, false testimony, deceit and violation of the ban imposed by the U.S. Congress in 1984 on arms supplies to contras.

The indictment points out that Fernandez who was in charge of the CIA's spy network in several Central American countries between 1984 and 1986, helped build in Costa Rica a secret airfield which was used as a transshipment point to supply contras with weapons and ammunition. Later on, he tried to obstruct the investigation of the Iran-contras affair, conducted by the Tower Commission, giving false testimonies at its hearings.

The document points out that Fernandez closely collaborated with Oliver North, a former staffer of the National Security Council, and retired USAF General Richard Secord, against whom criminal charges were brought three months ago. They were also set forth against John Poindexter, the former assistant to the President for national security affairs, and arms dealer Albert Hakim. All of them are regarded as "stars" of the Irangate affair, the biggest political scandal in the years of the present Republicn administration.

However a trial of the criminal "foursome" is being constantly put off under various pretexts. In the meantime the defence lawyer of Fernandez points out that his client is completely innocent, since he only fulfilled orders of his superiors. Indeed, investigators of the Irangate scandal uncovered evidence of the direct complicity in the secret affair of William Casey, the former CIA director. Fernandez' lawyer said that his client "had merely been following U.S. policies."

U.S., Israel To Cooperate on SDI-Related Project

LD2906091988 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 29 TASS—The United States has made a qualitatively new step towards building up the militarist potential of Israel.

On Tuesday, the White House announced in a special press release that during the stay of Israeli Defence Minister Yitzhak Rabin in Washington and during his talks with President Reagan and other administration leaders, it was agreed that soon Israel and the United States would sign a memorandum on joint work to develop a system of defence against tactical ballistic missiles. Eighty per cent of the work will be done by the United States and the rest by Israel.

The press release points out that this joint enterprise is an off branch of research in the field of the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI).

Correction to Shishlin Assesses Summit Results

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Shishlin Assesses Results of Moscow Summit," published in the 29 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 14-16:

Page 16, column one, paragraph three, line two: "...is now asserted in practical international life." (deleting "its way")

China

Alekseyev on 'Identical' Stands With China

OW2906165288 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Alekseyev commentary: "The Identical Stands of the USSR and China"—from "World Today" program]

[Text] The Soviet Union highly praises the improvements observed in Soviet-Chinese relations. Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Rogachev pointed out not long ago that because of new driving forces, the relations between the two countries, which had been frozen for more than 20 years, have been broadened and strengthened in many sectors. He also pointed out that people are very impressed by the results that have been achieved. During the 1982-87 period alone, the two countries' trade volume expanded 10 times, and the growth will reach 30 percent this year.

We are pleased to note that the USSR and China have also heightened their mutual understanding with each passing year in the field of international politics, especially in promoting peace and international security. China has made even more positive efforts in promoting nuclear disarmament in Asia. Soviet leader Gorbachev has stressed that this is a factor conducive to the improvement of the situation in Asia-Pacific region.

Regarding the many issues concerning regional security, the Soviet and Chinese stands are virtually identical. Take, for instance, their views toward the establishment of nuclear-free zones in the Asia-Pacific region. Countries in the South Pacific, including Australia and New Zealand, signed the Treaty of Rarotonga in 1986. Signing the appending protocols of that treaty, the USSR and China have become hitherto the only two nuclear countries having officially recognized the legitimacy of that treaty, which declares the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone.

Moscow and Beijing also support the ASEAN proposal of turning Southeast Asia into a nuclear-free zone. The USSR and China have pledged their utmost in assisting the realization of this proposal. Our two countries also support Democratic Korea's proposal of turning the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. Both the

Soviet and Chinese Governments have issued statements, stressing that they will make even greater contributions to the cause of establishing such a nuclear-free zone to promote peace and security in the Far East.

While the USSR and China share identical views toward these and other issues concerning the security of the Asia-Pacific region, it does not mean that the two countries have cooperated and coordinated their actions in this regard. However, we think we will do so in the near future. We also see that we share identical views that certain countries' consistent, principled stands toward some specific issues should be the prerequisite for them to fight for peace with concerted actions. Of course, the USSR and China also hold different views toward certain international issues in the Asia-Pacific region. Their differences, however, have noticeably been reduced. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, which began in May, has removed what China considers an obstacle impeding the complete normalization of relations of our two countries. As for the Cambodian issue, the USSR and China also can make significant contributions to its settlement as long as they do so in the spirit of good-neighborliness and friendship. Although their assessments of the Cambodian situation differ, their main observations are identical: The conflict must be mediated by peaceful means through negotiations.

PRC Relaxes Controls Over Performing Arts

PM2806155388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov report: "Contract for Premiere"]

[Text] Beijing—In China the state will no longer directly manage the majority of arts ensembles. Collectives and individuals will be authorized to freely set up companies and to engage in performance activities.

People in China prefer to implement radical transformations without haste, in the spirit of the saying: "Look before you leap." According to the new plan, the government will look after only a small number of arts ensembles, above all, those which need support: for instance, folk groups or experimental companies and ensembles in areas inhabited by national minorities. This was stated recently by PRC Culture Minister Wang Meng at a national conference devoted to cultural development strategy.

In the companies which remain in the care of the state, a new system of remuneration is to be introduced which will take into account the popularity of the actor, dancer, or singer. The highest category will include theater, movie, and light entertainment "stars." Private impresarios, entitled to set up their own ensembles, will be authorized to operate freely. Arts ensembles that have obtained state licenses will be able to compete on an equal basis with renowned collectives.

The newspapers, expressing support for the reform, are pointing out that this will make it possible to make more effective use of the means allocated by the state for the development of culture.

Fishery Delegation Holds Vladivostok Talks

OW2906032388 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 19 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, representatives from the Maritime Fishery Corporation and the China Fishery Corporation held talks in Vladivostok. Please listen to the following report by (Moyisheyev), a station correspondent to Vladivostok:

The Chinese delegation visited enterprises in the border cities of Khabarovsk and (Sahari), and thus had the opportunity to see various fish canneries and the fish-processing industry. During its visit to the maritime border areas, representatives of the delegation discussed with their Soviet counterparts the establishment of direct links between Soviet and Chinese processing enterprises in the Far East. The delegation visited the United Fishery Enterprise during its stay in Vladivostok. [passage omitted]

The Chinese delegation, headed by (Zhao Longyi), deputy manager of the China Fishery Corporation, inquired in detail about the operation of various workshops at the United Fishery Enterprise, and tasted its products. [passage omitted]

(Zhao Longyi), head of the Chinese delegation, made the following remarks on the prospects for cooperation between the two countries: [Passage omitted] If you [the United Fishery Enterprise] can export your products someday, please do not forget the purchasing units of this delegation. Before we came here, Guangdong, the southernmost province of China, asked us to purchase some cans from you on a trial basis. We hope your chief engineer and the factory director can help with this. [passage omitted]

During the talks, the Soviet and Chinese sides signed protocols and worked out approaches for more cooperation. Before leaving Vladivostok, Comrade (Zhao Longyi) said: [Passage omitted] The Maritime Fishery Enterprise is very much interested in cooperation with China. For this reason, they carry out intensive studies on all samples provided to China. They are now conducting an in-depth investigation of cod-liver oil and cod-liver oil products in a bid to develop them. In addition, they are prepared to sell, on a trial basis, cod-liver oil and cod-liver oil products made by Chinese methods. [passage omitted] Our USSR visit is aimed at intensifying understanding, exchanging information, and studying areas for future cooperation. I would like to note that, because we have just reached the initial stage of cooperation, we can only focus on understanding each other.

Currently, we cannot decide if we have achieved anything concrete. We may regard the exchanges of information and mutual understanding as an achievement. If you are eager to know what achievements we attained in the talks, then I would put it this way: During the talks, we discussed many issues of common concern in a sincere, friendly, and frank way, and both sides were satisfied. We can summarize our talks in one sentence: We intend to engage in wider cooperation and exchange more information.

Ni Zhifu Receives Trade Union Delegation

OW2906154388 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] A delegation of the Soviet Trade Union headed by Ikharlova, member of the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Union and [chairman of] the Textile and Light Industry Workers Union, visited many places and factories in China, and held discussions with leaders of the Chinese trade unions.

At a meeting with the delegation members on 25 June, Ni Zhifu, chairman of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions, expressed the hope that business contacts between the Chinese and Soviet trade unions can be further developed.

Relations With U.S. Communist Party Restored

LD2306104488 Moscow TASS in English 0944 GMT 23 Jun 88

[Text] Beijing June 22 TASS—Relations between the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of the USA have been restored. This was announced by member of the Standing Committee of the CPC Central Committee Hu Qili during today's meeting here with a delegation of the Communist Party of the USA led by its General Secretary Gus Hall, the XINHUA News Agency reports.

"Relations between the CPC and the Communist Party of the USA were ruptured for over 20 years, and we are very glad that they have been restored as a result of the current visit to China by General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA Gus Hall," Hu Qili said.

Hu Qili noted that there exist traditional relations of friendship between the two parties and the peoples of the two countries. The resumption of relations between the two parties meets the vital interests of the peoples of both countries and will be promoting the widening of their mutual understanding and ensurance of international peace.

'Friendly Nature' of Ties With Nepal Noted

PM2906145788 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 26 June 1988 in its Morning Edition carries on page 5 a 1,500-word article by own correspondent N. Paklin in Kathmandu headlined "Traveling the Roads of the Mountain Kingdom" in which he describes his journey to Kathmandu, commenting en route on Nepal's economic difficulties and also on the role played by the PRC in the Nepalese economy, as follows:

"The Chinese presence can also be felt here. It is not only apparent in the fact that many Nepalese are riding around on good-quality Chinese bicycles and the stores are selling Chinese crockery depicting a dragon, which is particularly fashionable this year. The PRC is giving its neighbor technical assistance in the construction of several enterprises. The friendly nature of Chinese-Nepalese relations is demonstrated by the visit to the PRC by King Birendra and Queen Aishwarya last September."

Northeast Asia

Kim Il-song Stops Over En Route to Mongolia

PRAVDA on Stopover

PM2906132988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Stopover in USSR"]

[Text] Naushki (Buryat ASSR), 28 Jun—Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and president of the DPRK, who is on his way to Mongolia for an official friendly visit, stopped over in our country 26 through 28 June.

Kim Il-song had meetings and talks with the leaders of party and soviet organs en route across Soviet territory during stops in Zabaykalsk, Chita, and Ulan-Ude. The guest was briefed on how the program for the comprehensive development of productive forces in the Far East Economic Region, the Buryat ASSR, and Chita Oblast is being implemented. Kim Il-song conveyed warm greetings to the participants in the 19th all-union party conference and wished them fruitful work.

The DPRK leader was accompanied by A.A. Mokanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR.

KCNA Details Visit

SK2706151588 Pyongyang KCNA in English 1459 GMT 27 Jun 88

[Text] Chita June 27 (KCNA)—The great leader Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, passed through Zabaykalsk and Chita, the Soviet Union, on his way to the Mongolian People's Republic for a visit.

He passed through Zabaykalsk, a border city of the Soviet Union, on the evening of June 26.

The national flags of our country and the Soviet Union symbolic of the traditional friendship and solidarity between the two countries were hung on the Zabaykalsk railway station building.

Present at the railway station were Comrade Aleksandr Mokanu, vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, officials concerned of the C.C., the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Soviet Foreign Ministry, who came to Zabaykalsk to meet and conduct President Kim Il-song to the Soviet-Mongolian borderline, leading officials of the party and power organs of the Chita region and Zabaykalsk District and the Army.

DPRK Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union Kwon Hui-kyong was also present.

President Kim Il-song alighted from the train and exchanged greetings with the Soviet cadres who came out to meet him.

He was presented with bunches of fragrant flowers by children.

President Kim Il-song went into the lounge of the station and had a cordial and friendly conversation with the cadres who came out to greet him.

A dinner was arranged that day in honour of President Kim Il-song by the Chita Regional Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Executive Committee of the Chita Regional Soviet of People's Deputies.

President Kim Il-song passed through Chita City on the morning of June 27.

Hanging at Chita railway station were the national flags of Korea and the Soviet Union.

President Kim Il-song was received at the railway station by leading officials of Chita regional and city party and government organs.

He was presented with bunches of fragrant flowers by the second secretary of the Chita City committee of the party and the chairman of the executive committee of the Chita City Soviet of People's Deputies.

President Kim Il-song exchanged greetings with the cadres who came out to greet him and had a conversation with them.

Greets Party, State Leaders

SK2806100788 Pyongyang KCNA in English 1001 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Pyongyang June 28 (KCNA)—Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, sent on June 28 a message of thanks to Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Comrade Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, upon crossing the borderline of the Soviet Union on his way to the Mongolian People's Republic for a visit.

The message says:

We received warm hospitality and all conveniences which are a token of deep fraternal comradeship from Soviet comrades this time, too, just as when we visited your country in May 1984.

I am pleased with this and express deep thanks to you.

I take this opportunity of sincerely wishing you and the people of the Soviet Union greater success in their endeavours to implement the decisions of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, accelerate socio-economic development and attain the development and prosperity of the country.

Passes Through Border City

SK2806103188 Pyongyang KCNA in English 1022 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Naushki June 28 (KCNA)—The great leader Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, passed through Ulan-Ude, the capital of the Buryat Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of the USSR, on the evening of June 27 on his way to the Mongolian People's Republic for a visit.

Flags of Korea and the Soviet Union were hanging at Ulan-Ude railway station.

President Kim Il-song was greeted by secretaries of the Buryat Regional Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the first vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Buryat Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the minister of interior, the chairman of the state security committee and other leading officials of party and power bodies of the Autonomous Republic and Ulan-Ude and the Army.

Women in beautiful national costumes presented bunches of fragrant flowers to President Kim Il-song.

He exchanged greetings with the Soviet cadres who came out to greet him and conversed with them in an amicable atmosphere.

He passed through Naushki, a Soviet-Mongolian border railway station, on the morning of June 28.

Flags of Korea and the Soviet Union and the slogan "Long live the indestructible friendship between the Soviet and the Korean peoples!" were hung at the railway station building.

Senior officials of the party and power bodies of the Buryat Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and Kakhta District, came out to the station to meet President Kim Il-song.

Comrade Aleksandr Mokanu, vice-president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, and other Soviet cadres who conducted President Kim Il-song to the borderline station from Zabaykalsk, sincerely wished him good health and great success in his visit to Mongolia.

DPRK President Arrives in Ulaanbaatar 28 Jun

LD2806223688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Korean Workers Party Central Committee and president of the DPRK, today arrived in Ulaanbaatar on an official friendly visit.

DPRK-Mongolian Talks Begin

LD2906194488 Moscow TASS in English 1916 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, June 29 TASS—Talks between general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic Jambyn Batmonh and general secretary of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party, President of the DPRK Kim Il-Song, on an official friendly visit in Mongolia, were held here today.

The sides informed each other about the course of socialist construction in the two countries, discussed the present state of and prospects for cooperation between Mongolia and the DPRK, exchanged opinions on international problems of mutual interest.

The Mongolian and Korean leaders noted that relations of friendship between the two parties, countries and peoples based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism develop successfully. It was emphasized that the creation of a durable political and legal basis for the development of relations between the two countries, enhancement of their effectivity are results of joint efforts of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the expression of internationalist policy of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the Korean Workers Party.

Discussing the international situation, the sides noted positive changes and breakthroughs taking place in the world as a result of vigorous activity of the Soviet Union, countries of the socialist community, all peace forces of thee globe. The leaders of Mongolia and of the DPRK highly assessed the results of the Soviet-American summits and noted unanimously that the beginning of the implementation of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has become a real step toward averting nuclear war, toward disarmament, and is of much importance for the improvement of East-West relations, for the normalisation of the military-political atmosphere in the world, including Asia.

The sides noted that disputed questions in international relations, specifically regional conflicts, should be resolved by peaceful means only.

Jambyn Batmonh expressed complete support for the tireless efforts of the DPRK aimed at the holding of military-political talks at the summit level between the north and the south, at the holding of a joint conference of representatives of political parties, public organizations and different sections of the population of the DPRK and South Korea. The Mongolian leader noted that the implementation of the proposals of the DPRK for the withdrawal of U.S. troops and weapons from South Korea, for the turning of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-weapons free, peaceful zone would create prerequisites for the strengthening of security in the Far East.

Kim Il-song expressed support for Mongolia's vigorous policy toward the consolidation of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

During the talks both leaders emphasized that the Nonaligned Movement is an influential factor in international life and expressed support and solidarity with the struggle of peoples declaring for freedom and national independence.

Congratulations Cabled to New Mongolian Minister

PM2806140988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Congratulations Cabled"]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has cabled congratulations to T. Gombosuren, Mongolian minister of foreign affairs, in connection with his appointment to this post.

Mongolian Political Officers Visit 16-23 Jun

PM2806135788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 88 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Mongolian Political Workers in the USSR"]

[Excerpt] A delegation of leading political workers from the Mongolian People's Army headed by Colonel T. Dashdzeveg, first deputy chief of the Mongolian People's Army Political Directorate, was in the Soviet Union 16 through 23 June at the invitation of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The Mongolian People's Army political workers were received by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. A conversation took place with Fleet Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

At the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate and the Transcaucasus Military District Political Directorate the Mongolian comrades were familiarized with the experience of party political work in the USSR Armed Forces, the activity of political organs to fulfill the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and CPSU Central Committee plenums on questions of restructuring, and the progress of the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference. [passage omitted]

Ryzhkov Meets With Mitsubishi Chairman

OW2906154988 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 Jun 88

[From "Soviet-Japanese Exchange News" in "Friendship and Good-Neighborliness" program]

[Text] Last week Mitsubishi Corporation's Board of Directors Chairman Nimura, who is concurrently vice chairman of the Japan-Soviet Economic Cooperation Committee, visited the Soviet Union. Chairman Nimura visited a set of Soviet ministries and agencies and met with Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov, Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Katushev, and other officials.

Japanese Foreign Minister Stops Over in Moscow

PM2806122588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "En Route for Home"]

[Text] Japanese Foreign Minister S. Uno made a brief stopover in Moscow 27 June en route for home.

Moscow Rebuts Takeshita Statement on Policy

OW2906124988 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] According to KYODO News Service, Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita stated in the summit conference of seven industrialized nations being held in Toronto, Canada, that the USSR's perestroyka has no impact on the Asia-Pacific region. We will now broadcast a commentary by Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev on this subject.

Perestroyka in Soviet foreign policy has led to the discarding of SS-20 missiles in Asia and the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. This alone proves that Soviet policy has tremendous impact on the situation in Asia. The great changes unfolding in Asia and the Pacific are a reality, and this cannot be ignored in formulating a rational political line. This should be very true also for Japan, which is an Asian country.

As a result of perestroyka, the USSR has come to pay great attention to developing its Far Eastern region. This also means that it will strive to establish economic ties with the Asia-Pacific countries based on the principle of mutual benefit. In order to establish economic ties, the USSR has created a State Commission on Cooperation With Asia and the Pacific. Commission Chairman Primakov attended the recent meeting of the Asia and Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference in Osaka. Is there anything wrong with widely promoting mutually beneficial cooperation with all Asian countries under the principle of equality?

According to one of his aides, Takeshita was trying to ostracize the USSR from the Asia and Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference. This statement was made in Vancouver on his way to the Toronto summit. Naturally, it is unfortunate that an ideology antagonistic to the Soviet Union lies behind such a statement. However, regardless of ideology, it should be understood that without the participation of the USSR, any international conference in the Asia-Pacific region will be, to say the least, incomplete.

Perestroyka in Soviet international affairs can only bear fruit if its foreign partners also change correspondingly. Without this, the new relaxation of tension could not have been possible. The various agreements signed recently and the constructive atmosphere created by the U.S.-USSR Moscow summit are the most evident examples of such relaxation of tensions. These have opened up great opportunities for adjusting various aspects of East-West relations. We cannot but wish that the present Toronto summit attain positive achievements to facilitate the adjustment of East-West relations.

During yesterday's meeting, the foreign ministers of the summit nations agreed on adopting a flexible policy toward the Soviet Union. Can't we say that the above-cited statement of Takeshita shows that the Western camp has not arrived at a consensus on the matter?

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Discusses Current Cambodian Situation

OW2906152388 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 19 Jun 88

[Korsunov commentary]

[Text] Public opinion in the world always focuses its attention on the Cambodian issue. The prospects for settling this issue have recently become increasingly clear. Station observer Korsunov, who visited Cambodia not long ago, now discusses his views on the current situation there.

As a foreigner, I also feel that disaster-ridden Cambodia needs peace. The Cambodian people now live in difficult circumstances. Their schools and industrial and mining enterprises have been destroyed, as has much of their farmland. While talking with Cambodian people, one can feel their exhaustion resulting from 20 years of turbulence. They long for a peaceful life—this is the desire of most Cambodian people no matter to which political group they belong.

I think it is such a desire that alleviates the domestic conflict to a certain extent. It is a driving force for national reconciliation. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea put forward a proposition for national reconciliation. So it is not fortuitous that about 5,000 members of the opposition faction gave up their armed struggle last year. I talked with some of them. The reason for their decision is very simple: They were exhausted as a result of running about in the jungle, wanted to live a normal life, and no longer believed the allegation that Vietnam wants to occupy Cambodia forever.

Vietnam withdrew 20,000 of its volunteers from Cambodia last year. This has enabled many people to see clearly the true policy being pursued by Vietnam. Last December I saw with my own eyes how warmly Phnom Penh residents sent off Vietnamese troops who were returning home. I believe that more people will awaken this year. Some 40,000 additional Vietnamese fighters will pull out by the end of June. A total of 50,000 troops will be withdrawn by the end of this year. Now, what worries most of the Cambodian people is another question—whether or not Pol Pot can have himself restored or whether or not the Khmer Rouge, an armed organization which has brought endless suffering to the Cambodian people, can be disbanded. It is natural for people to raise such a question: What are the positions taken by those Asian countries that are still supporting the armed forces of the Pol Pot clique? It can be said that political realism [zheng zhi xian shi zhu yi] will triumph in this respect. Proof is that not long ago, a Chinese official stated that China would no longer persist in wanting Pol Pot to regain political power. This is a very important political statement. Because of the efforts of Vietnam and Cambodia, a number of Asian countries now take a constructive position on the Cambodian issue. This is a new situation, which makes people hope that Cambodia will eventually achieve lasting peace.

Solutions for Cambodian Conflict Viewed

OW2906170188 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] According to reports from Hanoi and Phnom Penh, the General Command Headquarters of the Vietnamese volunteer army in Cambodia and its affiliated organizations will pull out from Cambodia and return home this month. This politically significant act is based on a joint decision made by the Vietnamese and Cambodian Governments. Some 50,000 Vietnamese officers and men will leave Cambodia for home this year.

Our station commentator Mulatov has this to say: The Vietnamese volunteers temporarily left behind in Cambodia will be put under the command of the Command Headquarters of the Cambodian Army. This is by no means a trick or deception but a very important step in the well-planned process of withdrawing the Vietnamese volunteer forces from Cambodia. Facts have borne out that there is no such thing as a Vietnamese annexation of Cambodia; it is absolutely groundless to say that military cooperation between the two neighboring states is a major cause of conflicts in Southeast Asia. What is important is that one must understand that both Vietnam and Cambodia have advocated a political solution to the Cambodian question to involve all parties concerned, and realize that there is a real possibility for constructive dialogues to discuss and mediate in the various problems concerning the Cambodian situation. This is very important. By all parties concerned, we mean the Indochinese and ASEAN countries, the PRK Government, and the various Khmer groups. Of course, the situation in Southeast Asia, to a considerably large extent, depends on the normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations.

The conflict in Southeast Asia has forced a heavy burden on the shoulders of the peoples of Cambodia, Thailand, and a series of other countries. Regional conflicts have brought endless calamities and suffering to the people of the countries involved and are threatening world peace at the same time, as pointed out in a PRAVDA editorial "Comply With the Geneva Agreement on Solving Regional Conflict [words indistinct]. The agreement mentioned here is the Geneva agreement on mediating in the Afghanistan situation. The disasters caused by regional confilcts, such as those in the Near East, South Africa, the Persian Gulf, and Central America must all be ended. In many instances I believe that to eliminate these conflicts, the Soviet Union and China can make direct contacts with each other, because the principled positions of our two countries are very close. Even where

differences exist, such as on the Cambodian question, there is a still a good chance that the parties concerned can get together to find constructive ways for solving the problem.

CPV Central Committee Plenum Reported

PM2806121588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Hanoi, 24 Jun—As already reported, Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee, delivered a speech at the CPV Central Committee plenum held in Hanoi 14 through 20 June. He emphasized that the party has adopted a number of important decisions during the period since the Sixth CPV Congress, but there has been no fundamental shift in the country's socioeconomic situation. In certain aspects the situation is continuing to deteriorate. The new structure of economic management is being introduced only slowly, complex problems are characteristic of the economic sphere, and a large number of negative phenomena is to be noted in the party and in society.

A very important condition for realizing the Sixth CPV Congress policy of all-around renewal, the Vietnamese leader went on to point out, is the renewal of the party itself and the accomplishment of a real revolution in the sphere of party building. The central issue here is the enhancement of the CPV's leading role—which, however, does not mean party committees supplanting administrative organs. The party must realize its vanguard role in society on the basis of improving ideological and organizational work and enhancing the militancy of party organizations. This is an important precondition for the success of renewal.

A movement to overcome negative phenomena and improve social relations is currently under way in the country, Nguyen Van Linh said. It is necessary to strengthen order and discipline in party organizations and rid ourselves of degenerate elements, and the chief criterion for assessing the activity of party members and cadre workers must be their actual contribution to the transformations.

Interview With SRV Foreign Minister Cited

PM2906095188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 88 Single Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Interview With VNA Agency"]

[Text] Hanoi, 28 Jun—The heads of many states and governments have assessed highly the SRV's decision to withdraw about half the Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia by the end of this year. This step attests to Vietnam's respect for the PRK and promotes the solution of the Cambodian problem by political means. The PRK is already strong enough to defend itself. SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach said this in an interview with a Vietnam News Agency correspondent.

As for fears in connection with the possibility of the restoration of the Pol Pot regime after the withdrawal of the Vietnam volunteer contingent, the minister noted that the world community must take decisive steps to rule out its return to power.

Nguyen Co Thach dwelled on the prospects of holding the meeting in Jakarta. There are attempts to turn it into a series of talks between Vietnam and Sihanouk, he said. This approach totally ignores the opinion of the Cambodian people themselves and is an attempt to eliminate the people's Cambodia, which has not been successfully achieved over the course of 9 years of armed force. The SRV firmly opposes actions aimed at drawing the countries taking part in the meeting into a discussion of Cambodia's strictly domestic affairs. The Vietnamese side believes that the PRK's domestic problems can be resolved only by the Cambodian people themselves.

Answering a question about Vietnamese-Thai relations, the minister said that his meetings with Thai leaders have opened a new page in bilateral cooperation aimed at achieving a political settlement of the Cambodian problem. Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon, Foreign Minister Sitthi Sawetsila, and General Chawalit Yongchaiyut, acting commander in chief of the country's Armed Forces, accepted an invitation from the Vietnamese side to visit the SRV, which attests to the improvement of relations between the two countries, Nguyen Co Thach said.

Station Observer Defends PRK, SRV

OW2906165688 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 20 Jun 88

[(Osotov) commentary]

[Text] The statement issued by the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry on 26 May has answered a series of questions concerning the situation and the relations among nations in the region. (Osotov), an observer of this station, has the following comments on this event:

It is not a secret that the tension between the Indochinese nations and the ASEAN nations, including the sharp difference between them over the Cambodia issue, has yielded the worst effects on the situation in the region. I would like to add that the tension provides an excuse for some external forces to interfere with the internal affairs of Southeast Asian countries. Such a situation has, of course, aroused a high degree of attention among the people and political activists in various countries in the region.

Thailand thinks that an early settlement of regional issues is of great significance. Malaysia stands for cooperation and effective cooperation among all Southeast

Asian nations. Indonesia is always willing to fulfill its obligations in regional affairs. These are the ASEAN nations. On the other hand, the many constructive proposals made by the three Indochinese nations for the purpose of creating a peaceful and stable situation in Southeast Asia and settling the Cambodia issue by political means are known to all people.

The Asian nations' aspirations for normalization of relations are reflected in the dialogues between the two groups of nations in Southeast Asia, one represented by Vietnam and the other represented by Indonesia. Proof of the aspirations is the famous Ho Chi Minh City resolution on an informal meeting in Jakarta of all Cambodian political forces. The aspirations now have a positive tendency, but the tendency must be further developed to become irreversible. The countries will strive to normalize their relations if they are truly concerned about normalization. A realistic proposal with balanced steps in consideration of the interests of all parties will be proof of such a concern.

As an unbiased observer, it is very clear to me that not everything is going smoothly in Southeast Asia. It will be even clearer if we take a look at the positions taken by those who oppose Cambodia and Vietnam. In their propaganda, they widely use the excuse of so-called Vietnamese military threat to Southeast Asian nations, particularly to Thailand. Although such an allegation is groundless, the media in some countries outside Southeast Asia is giving wide publicity to it.

Let us take a look at the 26 May statement of the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry. The statement points out that there are at least two steps that can ease tension on the Cambodian-Thai border under any circumstances. One is to drastically reduce the number of Vietnamese troops in Cambodia. In June alone, 40,000 Vietnamese troops will be withdrawn from there. By the end of the year, 50,000 Vietnamese troops will have been withdrawn. After the withdrawal, the Vietnamese People's Army troops in Cambodia will become a fraction as compared with the Thai military strength. The other is to pull back the Vietnamese volunteers' army 30 kilometers from the Thai-Cambodian border. Aren't these Vietnam's peace-loving gestures? Aren't they a rebuttal to the so-called Vietnamese threat? After the implementation of the measures announced by Vietnam, the term of so-called frontline countries will become completely meaningless. Thailand is called a frontline country by its foreign partners.

Speaking of efforts to normalize the Cambodian-Thai border situation and normalize the relations between Indochinese and ASEAN countries, the recent effort is not the Indochinese nations' first expression of their goodwill. The statement on national reconciliation policy and political mediation basis issued by the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea in August 1987 deals with vital issues between Phnom Penh and Bangkok, such as the situation of Cambodians in Thailand, and the possibility of their repatriation. To make joint efforts to settle these issues conforms to humanitarianism. This is precisely the way in which the Cambodian leaders deal with these issues.

If we thoroughly study the contents of the 26 May statement of the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry, we will reach the conclusion that the Indochinese nations are demonstrating their goodwill to solve a series of key problems that are used by certain forces to obstruct the dialogue between the two groups of Southeast Asian countries. It is regrettable that the constructive proposals made by Cambodia and Vietnam for peace and cooperation and for establishment of relations of equality have not yet gained actual response. However, some people are interested in the statement of the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry. The Indochinese nations will do their part. It depends on the other group to do the rest.

Near East & South Asia

Joint Soviet-Afghan News Conference Held

LD2906204888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondent Shkirando report on joint Soviet-Afghan news conference in Kabul with Major General A.A. Zakharov representing the Soviet Union and Major General Zabihullah Ziarmal representing Afghanistan—recorded]

[Text] [Shkirando] Issues related to the domestic political situation in Afghanistan since the Geneva accords came into force has aroused particular interest among all local and foreign journalists. Major General Zabihullah Ziarmal, head of the Chief Political Department of the Republic of Afghanistan Armed Forces, pointed out in his address that despite increased interference and caravans of weapons being brought from Pakistani territory by opposition groups, which is in violation of the Geneva accords, Afghan military units and subunits are currently independently defending the country's national sovereignty and territorial integrity. [video shows correspondent Shkirando at news conference, Major General A.A. Zakharov, and wall map of Konduz-Baglan area] To date, Zabihullah Ziarmal continued, there are already no Soviet troops in 18 provinces. The Afghan Armed Forces are fully in control of the situation and can defend peace and security in the country.

[Zakharov] To date, over 20,000 personnel have arrived home. Henceforth, the first stage of the withdrawal of Soviet troops will be carried out according to the schedule established by our Defense Ministry and government. By 15 August, in accordance with this schedule, on completion of the first stage, 50 percent of the personnel of the limited contingent of Soviet troops will have been withdrawn from the Republic of Afghanistan.

The withdrawal of Soviet troops is proceeding in the very difficult military and political situation which has taken shape in the Republic of Afghanistan, which is continually being whipped up by the military opposition in the form of shelling and various types of sabotage. Of course, all this makes it considerably more difficult to implement the instructions we received during preparations for the troop withdrawal before 15 May. But at present, everything is proceeding according to schedule. I think that we will also try to do everything to ensure that our men, ranks, sergeants, and corporals altogether, make their way out to their own homeland in full complement.

Gromov, Chervov on Withdrawal From Afghanistan
LD2906215388 Moscow TASS in English 2054 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—"Withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan proceeds strictly on schedule", said delegate to the 19th all-union conference of the CPSU, commander of the limited contingent of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan Lieutenant-General Boris Gromov. The lieutenant-general and chief of a department of (?the General) Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, Colonel-General Nikolay Chervov held a news conference at the USSR Defence Ministry today for a group of Soviet and foreign journalists covering (?the forum) of the Soviet Communists.

Boris Gromov noted that some 20,000 Soviet servicemen and 3,000 units of [word indistinct] combat equipment have been withdrawn from Afghanistan by now. Not a single Soviet soldier now remains in the provinces bordering on Pakistan.

The Soviet soldiers return home with a sense of duty performed. "We shall never forget those who died a hero's death, protecting the interests of the Afghan people," Boris Gromov said. Since the beginning of the troop withdrawal, the Soviet side lost some ten persons killed while 15 were wounded, but this way not during the march to return home, but as a result of the shellings of garrisons and acts of subversion.

Asked by journalists if the bringing of Soviet troops into Afghanistan was a mistake, Nikolay Chervov gave a negative answer. "Soviet troops were brought into Afghistan after numerous calls of the Afghan leadership. We could not deny assistance to a friendly people. It should not be forgotten, either, that we have a common state border with Afghanistan, stretching for a thousand kilometers, and that we are interested in peace and tranquility always reigning on that border."

In connection with all sort of speculations about the Afghan Army not being combat-ready, that are circulated in the West, General Gromov emphasized that the recent successful combat operations of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan in Qalat area attest to good combat preparedness of Afghan soldiers.

The Soviet military commanders emphasized that the settlement of the situation regarding Afghanistan will set a good example for the solution of other regional conflicts.

Kornilov Scores U.S. Stand on Afghan Agreements
PM2706083088 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 Jun 88 p 3

[Political observer Yuriy Kornilov "View of Events": "Afghanistan: Hopes and Worries"]

[Excerpts] It has been 6 weeks since the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan came into force—a package of concrete, balanced pledges to unblock one of the most acute and painful regional conflicts. Today we have every reason to say: For the Soviet Union, which signed the agreements, words and deeds do not diverge. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is continuing on schedule and our country demonstrates firm resolve to completely untie the "Afghan knot." Now that one-fourth of Soviet servicemen have already returned home, the whole absurdity and ludicrousness of the myths that were current in the West about "Moscow's expansionist plans" becomes clear. [passage omitted]

Concern must be caused by the position of certain U.S. circles. In the joint statement adopted at the beginning of June on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Moscow, it is noted that although serious disagreements emerged in the assessments both of the causes of regional tension and of the means to overcome it, the sides "agreed that these differences should not be an obstacle to constructive collaboration between the USSR and the United States." Some 3 weeks later, on 20 June, the U.S. President, together with the leaders of six other leading capitalist states who had assembled for the summit meeting in Toronto (Canada), signed a political declaration which says that "the Afghan people should have the opportunity to freely choose their government." That statement can only be welcomed. But how is the United States implementing the Moscow accords, what is it doing to put implement its own statements and declarations?

There can only be one answer to these questions, at least today: Unfortunately, in the case of Washington, which is one of the guarantors of the Geneva agreements, words and deeds diverge considerably. The flow of American weapons to opposition groupings goes on and the propaganda ballyhoo also continues, with the aim of misrepresenting the state of affairs in the Republic of Afghanistan and inciting the "irreconcilables" to new armed sorties. Washington makes no secret of the fact that the United States would like to see in Afghanistan a government formed by the opposition, and in particular its extremist wing. And what can one say about the appeals being made in the United States for a special envoy to be sent to Pakistan, elevated to the rank of "special ambassador" and entrusted with "monitoring resistance operations?" Such so-called "ideas" can only be seen as an attempt to hapmer the free will of the Afghan people and throw kindling onto the "Afghan camp fire."

Yes, the dangerous hegemonist ideas of "neoglobalism" once drawn up in Washington, far from being relegated to the archives, are still in the arsenal of a number of U.S. politicians, not to mention Pentagon and CIA strategists. This is indicated by the state of affairs around Afghanistan—and is also irrefutably confirmed by such facts as the continuing U.S. threats against sovereign Nicaragua, Washington's "strategic cooperation" with the Israeli annexationists, and U.S. support for the South African racists. Under Washington's classification, regional conflicts are called "low intensity wars." But in recent decades nearly 17 million people have died in such wars, and the number of victims is still growing...

The signing of the Geneva agreements is graphic evidence that the flame of regional conflicts can and should be extinguished. This requires just one thing: renunciation of attempts to export counterrevolution and the granting to every country and every people of the right to decide their own destiny. Time will tell how the "Afghan test" will be withstood by those who once played—and are still playing—such an unseemly role in kindling this and many other regional conflicts.

As for the Soviet Union, its commitment to the Geneva agreements is unshakable. Soviet people believe: However complex and difficult the path to lasting peace in Afghanistan may be, that path will be trodden!

International Aid To Free Soviet POW's Urged

PM2906145588 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 88 p 14

[Article by Yevgeniy Yevtushenko under the rubric "The Sacred Commandment Is 'No One Is Forgotten'": "Mutual Humanity"]

[Text] The withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan is evidence that political common sense and morality can be united. Democracy is guaranteed only when politics is determined by morality, and not vice versa. But just as it would be immoral to continue this war, so it is immoral now to remain indifferent to the Soviet soldiers who are in captivity. These were not hired killers but men who had been mobilized—future peasants and workers, or maybe potentially great scientists, artists, and poets. They cannot be blamed for the Afghan tragedy, for they are also its victims. Some day when the books full of bogus bravado, superficial reportages, and macho documentaries are forgotten, some former veteran who has been through the terrible school of Afghan ordeals and has become a Soviet movie director will create, like his U.S. colleague Oliver Stone, his own "Platoon" which will shake the whole of mankind.

Despite the divisions among peoples, they must all unite on the basis of mercy toward any hostages and prisoners of war.

Yes, I was grieved when our government once failed to take a resolute position on the U.S. hostages in Iran. I am not a politician, but if it was up to me, I would have sent our boys in blue berets to Tehran to rescue the Americans and there would have been nothing else for President Carter to do but sit in the front row at the opening of the Moscow Olympics. But at that time, unfortunately, politics on both sides prevailed over morality. Now times are changing.

Thanks to the new thinking—the only salvation in the shadow of a bomb crammed with the greatest immorality: killing everyone in one go—morality is increasingly permeating politics. For this reason I appeal to all Western powers and "Third World" countries to use the weight of their authority to rescue our soldiers. Tomorrow or the day after the children of one country or another could fall into dangerous hands, and we will go to their assistance. Mutual salvation for humanity lies in mutual humanity.

Committee on Prisoners in Afganistan Meets

LD2906202988 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—"We urge the broadest sections of the Soviet public to speak up so that our soldiers who have been taken prisoner in Afghanistan and those who hold them prisoner should know that Soviet soldiers have not been forgotten by the country and people, that they are remembered and waited for", said Vladimir Lomonosov, deputy chairman of the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet. He spoke in the House of Trade Unions today at the constituent meeting of the coordination committee of the Soviet Public for the release of Soviet soldiers taken prisoner in Afghanistan. V. Lomonosov was elected the committee's president.

"Our soldiers are returning home upon fulfilling their internationalist duty with honours", V. Lomonosov said. "Their road home is not easy. Ambushes and shelling, highland roads studded with mines, heat and suffering from the shortage of oxygen—such is the incomplete list of trials which our sons and daughters, rendering aid to the friendly people of Afghanistan, have to withstand. (?Some) of them have already returned home. Others are to return soon. But there are those among our soldiers whose destiny concerns us particularly. I mean Soviet soldiers who were taken prisoner and are missing. What has happened to them? Where are they? To learn about this and to help those who can still be helped is the noble task for the [words indistinct] committee has been formed".

"Efforts should not be spared to achieve the humane aim of freeing our soldiers", V. Lomonosov said. "We shall be knocking at the doors of the United Nations and UNESCO, Amnesty International and the International Committee for the Rescue of Russian Prisoners of War in Afghanistan, recently set up in the USA, governmental

institutions and agencies, youth, religious and non-governmental organizations. We are determined to ensure that everyone of whom we know that they are alive and are prisoners of war return home."

"In its work the committee counts on the support of broad international public holding humanistic positions", V. Lomonosov said in an interview to TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov. "We intend to get in touch with representatives of the public of a number of countries including Pakistan, Iran, the United States. It is known that a number of public organizations in the West maintain relations with the Afghan opposition, that their representatives visited and visit its camps. I think it will be justifiable to ask them for assistance in bringing about the release of Soviet citizens", V. Lomonosov said.

Zaykov Meets Kabul City Party Delegation

PM2806132788 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 88 p 1

[MOSTASS report: "In a Spirit of Friendship and Good-Neighborliness"]

[Text] The relations of friendship and good-neighborliness and the close cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan and the two fraternal capitals will continue to strengthen for the benefit of our peoples. The Geneva agreements, achieved thanks to the love of peace and good will of the USSR and the people's power in Afghanistan, pave the way toward peaceful settlement of the situation around this country and help to strengthen international security.

This was emphasized 16 June during a meeting between L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and D. Razmyar, secretary of both the PDPA Central Committee and the Kabul City Party Committee, and other members of the Kabul City delegation which is visiting Moscow.

There was discussion of questions concerning the further development of friendship and cooperation between the two capitals and the provision of sponsorship assistance by Moscow's enterprises and organizations to their partners in Kabul.

L.N. Zaykov spoke about the preparations of Moscow's Communists for the 19th all-union party conference. The Afghan visitors described the implementation of the national reconciliation policy in their country.

Afghan Tribesmen Reject 'Transitional Government'

PM2906143188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Protest Memorandum. Extremists in the Pillory"]

[Text] Islamabad, 28 Jun—The large group (150 people) of representatives of the Afghan opposition in Peshawar who have come from eight Afghan provinces (Qandahar, Zabul, Jowzjan, Farah, Nimruz, Herat, Badghis, and Ghowr), refugee camps in Baluchistan and Pakistan's North-West Frontier Province, the West European countries, and the United States, have presented the leaders of the "Alliance of Seven" with a memorandum protesting against the creation of a so-called "transitional government of mujahidin." The group, which represents the feelings of the so-called middle layer of the Afghan opposition, comprises the leaders of Pushtun tribes, Hazara, Tajiks, Baluchis, and Aymany [name as published], religious leaders, mujahidin field commanders, the heads of refugee clans, supporters of former King Zaher Shah, and representatives of the intelligentsia.

"The Afghan people," the memorandum states, "previously thought that the Peshawar figures were involved in a holy war in the name of God and Afghanistan's freedom; now everyone can see that they are just after power for their own personal advantage."

The memorandum stresses that the "transitional government" has no right to act on behalf of the Afghan people and will never be accepted by them.

In an interview with the newspaper THE MUSLIM, the leader of the group—Haji Karim Khan (chief of the Baluchi tribe inhabiting the Qandahar region) assessed the "transitional government of mujahidin" as a self-styled entity incapable of ensuring peace in Afghanistan, and he called the "alliance's" announcement about forthcoming elections "a farce."

Turkmenistan Aids in Afghan Water, Book Supplies

PM2906141188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[B. Gafurov article: "Neighbor to Neighbor: Multifaceted Soviet-Afghan Cooperation Expanding and Strengthening"]

[Text] The cause of friendship, the development of businesslike ties, and the improvement of the Afghan economy are served by the good relations between Soviet Turkmenia and Afghanistan.

A drop of water is like gold dust. This ancient Turkmen proverb has the same meaning to the peoples of Afghanistan, too. For that reason one of the first joint undertakings between the two neighbors—Turkmenia and Afghanistan—was the sinking of wells for water in Herat city.

For over 1 year now a program of expanding economic, trade, and scientific and technical ties between the two republics has been working effectively. The Soviet cooperation partners are enterprises and organizations from Ashkhabad, Mary, and Chardzhou Oblasts and Ashkhabad city, while the Afghan side is represented by Herat, Badghis, and Faryab Provinces.

Labor collectives in Ashkhabad Oblast have presented the Afghans with a mobile pumping station and power generating stations, tractors, trucks, and medical and construction equipment—in total worth more than R1 million. Turkmenistan as a whole has given Afghan provinces aid worth more than R3 million through direct sponsorship ties.

Young Afghan men and women are studying at VUZ's and vocational and technical colleges in Turkmenistan and agricultural and power industry specialists and municipal services workers regularly visit Herat. Power industry and printing workers in particular have concluded direct contracts on cooperation with their colleagues in Afghanistan and are already implementing them.

The policy of national reconciliation now being pursued in Afghanistan needs further development and the improvement of national relations, T. Amangeldyyev, chairman of the Turkmen SSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, said. "We know that thousands of Turkmen nationals reside in the neighboring country. Under a protocol we signed last September 10 different textbooks and an explanatory dictionary of the Turkmen language will be published."

An accord has also been reached on regular book fairs in each other's country. The first fair of this kind was held recently in Ashkhabad and the second is planned for next fall in Kabul. Many volumes of different types of literature were presented to the Afghans last year. Our specialists give technical assistance to the friendly country's printing workers and organize training for its printers at printing enterprises in Ashkhabad city. This will continue. May the printed word help to strengthen peace on Afghan soil.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ghanaian-Soviet Consultations End in Moscow

LD2806062388 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Soviet-Ghanaian consultations on international issues posing mutual interest ended in Moscow on 27 June. A complex of issues, covering bilateral relations, was also discussed. On the Ghanaian side, the deputy secretary for foreign affairs, Mohammad Ibn Chambass, of the Provisional National Defense Council, took part in the exchange of opinions. He had meetings with the deputy foreign minister, Anatoliy Adamishin, of the Soviet Union, and deputy minister for economic relations with foreign countries, Burmistrov, of the USSR.

Burkinabe Minister Interviewed on USSR Visit

LD2506222088 Moscow International Service in French 1900 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] [Announcer] Mr Jean-Marc Palm, Burkina Faso's external relations minister, has come to the Soviet Union on a working visit. Here is an interview he had with our correspondent:

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Mr Minister, what was the aim and agenda for your visit to the Soviet Union?

[Palm] My visit to the Soviet Union is mainly a working, friendly visit. You know that the Soviet Union and Burkina Faso [words indistinct] which go back a long way. Since 4 August 1983, the date when the revolutionary process started, these relations [words indistinct] better quality. [Word indistinct] the visit we are duscussing problems of mutual interest. So [words indistinct] this visit [words indistinct] the framework of friendship and in the same (?framework) of work.

[Correspondent] So what was planned for your visit? What was the program [words indistinct] of your visit?

[Palm] The program of the visit [word indistinct] (?on) talks with the Soviet authorities at state and party level. Consequently, I met with the deputy foreign minister. I also had a meeting at the Central Committee. The members of the delegation also had talks at other levels about [words indistinct] issues, in particular on questions, problems concerning international [words indistinct] and economic issues, including international ones. This is the program for the visit.

[Correspondent] Mr Minister, will you tell us what issues were brought up, I mean, what questions were discussed during your meetings with Soviet officials?

[Palm] With the Soviet officials, the topic on the agenda today is that of disarmament. One has to pay tribute to the Soviet Union for taking the initiative in this matter which is of importance today not only for the developed countries but also for countries like our own. We must also pay tribute to the Soviet Union for having linked this problem of disarmament, peace, and security with the development issue. These are the kind of problems we discussed with the Soviet authorities.

[Correspondent] Were your viewpoints on this issue the same?

[Palm] Let us say that generally speaking, we have the same approach to the problems we discussed, whether these involve disarmament or questions such as the new international economic order, or even issues like the debts of developing countries. The approach that the Soviet side has and the approach that we have are basically the same.

[Correspondent] Were questions concerned with the development of bilateral ties between our two countries also discussed during these meetings?

[Palm] Obviously, there could be no question of only [words indistinct]. Of course, we discussed the issue of bilateral cooperation, in particular the question of economic cooperation, because we believe that—and the Soviet side agrees with us on this—that we must deal in

concrete terms within the framework of cooperation. We therefore discussed a number of questions that had already been submitted to the Soviet side. We made a start on these questions. Other (?missions) will no doubt go more deeply into the different questions we discussed during our stay.

[Correspondent] How would you characterize the present state of Soviet-Burkinabe relations?

[Palm] [Words indistinct] the Soviet side, we can say that the state of relations between the Soviet Union and Burkina Faso is globally positive. We believe that this will continue, that our relations will grow stronger and deeper. The prospects for the development of these relations are, in our view, good in that there is goodwill on both sides, there is political determination. We believe that this is the main thing, it is the basis. Starting from there, we can therefore agree on concrete projects, on a political level as well as an economic and cultural level.

[Correspondent] As far as concrete projects are concerned, can we now talk about some of these projects?

[Palm] With regard to concrete projects, there is the involvement of our Soviet friends in the field of hydraulics. People are talking more and more about the involvement of our Soviet friends in the field of livestock farming. This is an important issue for us, but there are other matters still under discussion with the Soviet side. (?Allow me) for the time being not to reveal these matters currently under discussion between us.

[Correspondent] Can one say that you are satisfied with the result of your visit to the Soviet Union, with your meetings with Soviet officials?

[Palm] It should be pointed out that this visit is the first made by a prominent Burkinabe figure to the Soviet Union since the changes that occurred in our country on 15 October 1987. This is an initial approach and the talks, the kind of talks we have had, allow us to be satisfied with our stay here in the Soviet Union. [end recording]

Guinea-Bissau Talks on Angola Reported
LD3006024888 Moscow in Portuguese to Africa 1830 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] The Lusophone heads of state conference of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe has been held in the capital of Guinea-Bissau. The participants discussed a settlement in Angola following the recent meeting in Cairo on normalizing the situation in southern Africa. The Cairo meeting involved representatives of Angola, Cuba, the United States, and South Africa.

Speaking at the conference, Angolan President Jose Eduardo dos Santos said that the war front situation is now less tense. Angolan troops are advancing on the country's southern border, he said, and South Africa should not consider these actions to be a threat to its borders. Angola is working to find a political solution in southern Africa and is bearing Namibian independence in mind.

The participants approved a declaration condemning South Africa and calling on the international public to take steps to end apartheid.

Commentary Links Namibian Fight, Talks Progress
MB2806201888 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1800 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Commentary by Mikhail Tsolivon]

[Text] The slogan, 435 Now, is written all over the house walls in Namibian townships. This is the number of the UN Security Council Resolution on granting independence to that country.

The process of decolonization has new prospects now. A new round of talks has been held in Cairo between the delegations of Angola, Cuba, the United States, and South Africa. Though the sides failed to agree, they have decided to carry on their talks. The most significant fact is that the talks have been held, irrespective of their content. That signals a certain change in Pretoria's attitude, which was earlier grave and irreconcilable. Though its spokesmen are still trying to link two different questions—the withdrawal of Cuban troops, and Namibia's independence—their approach is becoming more realistic.

What has made Pretoria change its hard-line policy? The answer lies in the active struggle of the Namibian people on the political, military, and diplomatic fronts. As the executive secretary of SWAPO [South-West African People's Organization], Moses Garoeb, said recently, the struggle has been raised to a new, qualitative level, and the political awareness of the working people has greatly increased. The enemy has been cornered, says Garoeb. We have many times warned the racists and their imperialist sponsors that they have more chance to reach an agreement with SWAPO under its present generation of leaders, because the next general will probably know only the language of force.

Recently the people of Namibia demonstrated their unity when over 90 percent of all workers stayed away from work in reply to the call for holding a national strike of solidarity with the striking school students. More than 60,000 school students are boycotting their classes, demanding the removal of South African military bases from the Namibian territory.

The struggle is being stepped up despite intimidation on the part of the South African Koevoet [crowbar] death squadrons, despite unlawful arrests and repressions, and the threat of imposing an emergency rule. Resolution 435 now, demand the Namibians.

East Europe

Hungarian-Romanian Dispute Observed

LD2906224688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] TASS—The Romanian agency AGERPRESS has reported that a plenum of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee has taken place in Bucharest. The plenum approved the content of a letter from the party Central Committee to the MSZMP Central Committee on the problem of relations between Romania and Hungary. Those taking part in the plenum pointed out that in the interest of both peoples, it is essential to do everything possible to normalize relations between the two socialist states. Nicolae Ceausescu spoke at the plenum.

MTI has carried a statement in connection with the decision by the Romanian party and state leadership to end the operation of the Hungarian Consulate General in Cluj-Napoca. Pointing out the gravity of such a step which violates the consular agreement between the Hungarian People's Republic and the Socialist Republic of Romania, the agency emphasizes the determination of the country's government to conduct a policy aimed at deepening friendship between the Hungarian and Romanian peoples.

Upcoming Grosz Visit in July Previewed

LD2506134988 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 1900 GMT 24 Jun 88

[Text] Dear listeners, as we have reported, Karoly Grosz, MSZMP general secretary and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, will arrive in the Soviet Union on a working visit at the beginning of July at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. Here is our special correspondent, Yuriy Rogov:

[Rogov] Good evening, dear listeners. The meetings and talks of the party and state leaders of our countries always are of great significance, and they have had a decisive influence on Soviet-Hungarian cooperation. But in this respect the visit which is now to follow should be of special significance. This, of course, is my opinion.

What do I take as my point of departure? First, the visit will take place directly after the 19th national party conference. Judging from the press debate concerning the platform of the party conference, the resolutions of the party forum will exert a direct influence on the nature of our country's cooperation with the fraternal partner countries. During the debate of the Theses, the experts have made a lot of specific proposals which aim to improve the efficiency of bilateral and multilateral cooperation within the CEMA framework and to make this cooperation more specific and operative.

I believe that I do not have to remind our dear listeners of the already operating joint enterprises, of the direct relations which are taking shape between the kindred working collectives, of the increase in autonomy of the individual Soviet federal republics in the external market. This trend doubtlessly will (?attain) the approval of the party conference and meet with further development.

The second aspect which bestows a special significance on Comrade Grosz' visit to the Soviet Union is that we especially clearly see the joint objectives and tasks that unite us. If we carefully analyze the restructuring program being implemented in our country, and the program of stabilization and resurgence which has been adopted in Hungary, there is a striking similarity between the vast tasks in the programs to be implemented. It is always easier to do the complex tasks with joint force.

All this gives special importance to the coming visit of the MSZMP general secretary. His meetings and talks with Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev doubtlessly will create a very important phase of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation.

Non-Communist Proposed for Hungarian State Post

PM2806154988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent B. Rodionov report: "Hungary: Nonparty Candidate Put Forward"]

[Text] Budapest—Nonparty people have the same right as Communists to occupy any leading post in the state or society—this principle was proclaimed in Hungary many years ago. However, in practice it is by no means always observed.

Therefore, it is of fundamental importance that the MSZMP Central Committee Plenum has proposed to the Hungarian National Assembly that a nonparty public figure be elected to the post of president of the Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic: This high confidence has been shown by the party in Academician Bruno F. Straub, who is in charge of environmental conservation in the country and has of late been vigorously conducting the work of the parliamentary commission for the development of population centers and environmental protection.

The elections are scheduled for 29 June.

Poles Given 'Complete Economic Freedom'

PM2906084188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[A. Bondar report: "Scope for Initiative. The Polish Sejm Has Passed a New Law on Economic Activity"]

[Text] Warsaw—"A revolutionary constitution for the economy," say some. "Let's wait and see," say the skeptics. "A lot of good laws have been passed in our country...."

However, this one is quite unprecedented. What is the essence of the new law?

Its main idea is to provide complete economic freedom, free scope for any sensible initiative. The law will "go into action" next year.

It is based on three principles.

The first principle is that anything that is not forbidden is allowed. Specific legal guidelines are being drawn up to define the free sphere of action. Restrictions—and there are not many of them—pertain exclusively to the protection of citizens' rights and of the country's vital interests. The law, for instance, lays down that the banking system remains a prerogative of the state.

For the rest—and this is the second principle—everyone has the right at his own risk and peril to engage in economic activity in any sphere, within the strictures of the law, of course. This applies in equal measure to cooperatives, state enterprises, and above all to the private entrepreneur.

Attitudes to the latter are divided here. On the one hand, the private entrepreneur's prices are considerably higher than those in the state stores. On the other hand, it is the private entrepreneurs who show the initiative and are most enterprising, it is they who react instantly to demand. Many private firms have good traditions and strictly control the quality of the goods and services they offer.

The state's policy in respect of private entrepreneurs has not been clear-cut. There have been thaws and there have been freezes. Now a principled step is being taken. If someone wants to sew, bake, or repair cars in his free time, outside his main job, he will need no permission, registration, or license. The only thing he must not forget is to pay taxes on his income. A sphere of action is opening up which will require a minimum of formalities. If there is no reply to an application for registration within 2 months, then that is tantamount to authorization. There is no need for a pile of documents to prove that you have the necessary premises, that fire safety precautions have been met, that your activity as such will not damage the environment, and a thousand other requirements. From the new year this will be the duty of the appropriate organs: They will have to keep an eye open to ensure that everything is correct, and, if necessary, to prove that you are in the wrong.

The third principle follows on from the second and clarifies it: All economic sectors are equal before the law and operate in equal conditions. This means unrestricted competition, so to speak. And that, in the view of Polish economists, is the road to a sound economy.

The situation in the country as regards raw materials, fuel, and semi-finished goods is under strain. Hitherto "most favored nation status" has applied to state enterprises in terms of prices, and quantities, and delivery deadlines, and this again plays into the hands of the "mammoths" which operate on the principles of a cost-based economy. It is planned to establish the kind of market where prices will depend on demand, as at an auction. As a result the most cost-conscious will stand to gain.

To this I will add that in the new conditions enterprises will be able to merge, split, take on any shape, form temporary associations and so forth, and establish cooperatives regardless of what sectors the individual partners belong to.

The law was drafted and passed even earlier than originally planned with a view to eradicating the deep-seated problems of the Polish economy—imbalance, poor functioning of many production structures, shortages of raw materials and modern equipment, excessive expenditure, difficulties in breaking into the foreign market, inflation, debts, and low labor productivity. The aim of the law is to achieve a balance, not a conditional balance but a genuine balance capable of absorbing any shocks resulting from the changing economic situation in the country or the world.

So far this has not existed in Poland. The social tension in April-May only served to confirm this. Prior to that the government raised the prices for a number of goods, with partial monetary compensation, in order to try at least to some extent to balance the market. Inflation had climbed to the 26-percent mark over the past year. Enterprises began "of their own accord" to increase workers' wages while labor productivity had not changed. Prices rose, triggering new wage rises. Later it was calculated that prices had risen on average by 45 percent and wages by 60 percent. Economic and production difficulties grew worse and the burden of the country's 40-billion foreign currency debt weighed even heavier. Inflation set off at a gallop. The correlations between productivity, prices, and gold reserves were dangerously strained. The "black market" boosted the dollar rate to Z1,500. At this rate of exchange to the local currency it turned out that you could buy an elegant pair of shoes at a state store for $3, and a good suit for $10. Then, in late April and early May, the tension broke out into strikes. They were not long, nor of a mass character, but the specter of 1980 was looming on the horizon.

Common sense won the upper hand. By decision of the Sejm the Polish Government obtained special powers to freeze wages and control prices until the end of the year.

The law is giving rise to many questions. For instance, if anyone is allowed to engage in economic activity after work, will the market not be flooded with all kinds of trash? This could happen. However, most economists believe that it is possible only during a transitional period. There will be choice, and clients will vote with their wages for the best goods. It will be these goods which will conquer the market and flourish to benefit their producers and the consumer. Surprisingly, it is precisely the representatives of private initiative who are opposed to economic freedom. The reason is simple. They are afraid of increased competition. There is no special harm in this. Rather, it inspires hope that in time the private entrepreneur's prices will no longer put off the consumer on an average income.

Enterprise collectives are excited: What is going to happen? Enterprising leaders sense a wind of change, although an element of risk remains.

Poland's Glemp Views Church-State Relations

PM2906154788 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 25, 18-24 Jun (Signed to Press 16 Jun 88) p 6

[Interview with Polish Cardinal Glemp by correspondent A. Golub: "Cardinal J. Glemp on Relations Between Church and State"—first three paragraphs are introduction]

[Excerpt] "Membership of the church is seen as incompatible with the socialist philosophy. At the same time, Poland, the majority of whose population is Catholic, is building socialism. How is this to be explained?"

[Signed] A. Kryzhanovskaya, Moscow.

Our correspondent A. Golub put these and some other questions connected with the status of the church in Poland to Cardinal Jozef Glemp, primate of the Polish Catholic Church, during his stay in Moscow to celebrate the millennium of the baptism of Russia.

Correspondent: Among the Polish believers there are many PZPR members. How can membership of the party be compatible with religious beliefs?

Glemp: Believers want to be actively involved in building a new Poland. And some of them believe that outside the party they cannot fully exploit their strength and ability. At the same time, the party also needs active people and turns a blind eye to their religious beliefs.

Correspondent: What form have relations between church and state taken of late?

Glemp: Various forms. There have been very difficult periods. But now we have reached the level of dialogue and cooperation. The socialism that exists in Poland now does not persecute religion. But there have been times when the church has been prohibited from building new churches. At present the state is being helpful to believers and is not preventing building.

Correspondent: According to church data, around 1,000 churches have been built in the Republic in the last 7-8 years. At the same time, it is known that the majority of Poles are not very rich. And although donations to the church are voluntary, are they not depriving themselves and their families?

Glemp: Building is inexpensive because money is only spent on materials, with the believers themselves doing the work voluntarily for nothing. I also want to say the churches are being built mainly in new residential areas whose inhabitants want to mix with one another and perform religious rites.

Correspondent: You have had occasion to meet with Polish State Council Chairman Wojciech Jaruzelski. Are these meetings regular or sporadic?

Glemp: We meet regularly. We have already had more than 20 meetings. So one could say that there is a permanency about them. Both W. Jaruzelski and I regard these meetings as very productive and useful.

Correspondent: And where do you meet, if it is not a secret? On the territory of the church, so to speak, or the state?

Glemp: We meet in the government apartments, but not in office premises. [passage omitted]

Briefs

Computer Company With Hungary

In Donetsk, a joint Soviet-Hungarian company, Intercomputer, has been set up. It will devise and commission efficient technical program complexes and computer technology in the USSR and abroad. Profit will be shared by the partners according to contribution to the development of the enterprise. [Summary] [*LD2906043788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 28 Jun 88*]

Political & Social

PRAVDA on Gromyko Award Ceremony Speech

PM2706160188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Awards to Labor Heroes"]

[Text] On 21 June in the Kremlin, A.A. Gromyko presented "Hammer and Sickle" gold medals and Orders of Lenin to a group of Heroes of Socialist Labor.

For outstanding services in obtaining high grain and feed crop harvests via the use of intensive techniques, increasing the production and sale to the state of crop and livestock products, and for labor valor, awards were made to the following: from the Kirghiz SSR—N.I. Meshkov, director of the "Kyzyl-dzhar" Sovkhoz in Osh Oblast's Dzhany-Dzholskiy Rayon; Zh. Moydunov, link leader at the "Yassy" Sovkhoz in Osh Oblast's Uzgenskiy Rayon; and M.P. Rogozhin, chief engineer of an experimental farm of the Kirghiz State Zonal Machine Testing Station in Kantskiy Rayon; from Altay Kray—I.Ye. Zanin, first secretary of Smolenskiy CPSU Raykom; G.I. Kolykhalov, chief agronomist of the "Velikiy Oktyabr" Kolkhoz in Troitskiy Rayon; G.I. Petrov, machine operator of the "Anuyskiy" Sovkhoz in Petropavlovskiy Rayon; and D.I. Tyapkin, team leader at the "Srostinskiy" Sovkhoz in Biyskiy Rayon; and from Sakhalin Oblast—V.L. Ilyuticheva, milking machine operator from the "Sokolovskiy" Sovkhoz in Dolinskiy Rayon. Awards were also presented to A.I. Biryulin, lathe operator from the Kazan V.I. Lenin Science and Production Association, for outstanding production achievements and the successful fulfillment of socialist pledges, and to M.T. Semenova, ballet teacher at the Bolshoy Theater, for great services in the development of Soviet choreography.

Addressing the award recipients, A.A. Gromyko said:

Dear Comrades!

Today pacemakers in agricultural production have received high motherland awards. Also, similar awards have been made to an outstanding lathe operator and a renowned ballet teacher. They have all joined the ranks of those whom the motherland has glorified. The title Hero of Socialist Labor has been conferred on them, and they have been awarded the Hammer and Sickle gold medal and the Order of Lenin.

Among them, we honor a group of innovators who during the period of restructuring have shown how work can and should be done in the countryside.

Three of the Heroes of Socialist Labor come from Kirghizia. They are Nikolay Iosifovich Meshkov, director of a sovkhoz, Zhumakadyr Moydunov, leader of a team of corn growers, and Mikhail Petrovich Rogozhin, an engineer. On the face of it, these are different kinds of people: One heads a large, highly mechanized cotton and livestock production farm, while another leads a family link which includes his wife and son and has mastered intensive corn production techniques to perfection. The third is an excellent organizer of machine operators' labor.

Yet they all have much in common.

These are people who know how to calculate or, in today's parlance, who possess modern economic thinking. They are fine organizers, they have a good knowledge of their production unit, and they are utterly dedicated to the land. They have devoted decades, virtually their whole lives, to their beloved cause, which they regard as their offspring, and they generously share their experience and knowledge. That is surely why more and more people from all parts of Kirghizia and from neighboring Uzbekistan and Tajikistan go to study at the farms where they work—and these are all different rayons in the republic.

There are also four representatives of the Altay countryside here before us today. They are Ivan Yegorovich Zanin, Gennadiy Ivanovich Kolykhakov, Gennadiy Ivanovich Petrov, and Dmitriy Ivanovich Tyashkin—a party worker, a kolkhoz chief agronomist, a machine operator, and a stock raiser.

The particular characteristic of Smolenskiy Rayon, where Ivan Yegorovich Zanin is party raykom first secretary, is that it is in the remote depths of the Altay. Nevertheless, all the rayon's farms went over to self-capitalization and self-financing last year. The entire rayon has become a school of advanced experience to which people go to master new economic management methods from all parts of the Altay Kray and Siberia.

Gennadiy Ivanovich Kolykhalov is chief agronomist at the "Velikiy Oktyabr" Kolkhoz in Troitskiy Rayon, and that kolkhoz is also a school of advanced experience for the entire kray. This is where innovation in crop farming can be learned.

As for Gennadiy Ivanovich Petrov, the job section in his labor record contains just one entry, which at first glance may seem modest: "Machine operator at the 'Anuyskiy' Sovkhoz in Altay Kray's Petropavloskiy Rayon since 1955." An enviable and fine constancy coupled with a tremendous increase in professional skill! For many years in a row, he has achieved the highest grain harvesting indicators in the kray.

Stockraising team leader Dmitriy Ivanovich Tyapkin has a perfect mastery of advanced methods of the feeding and tending of animals and for that reason output in that collective is extremely high.

Here in the Kremlin we are honoring you, the zealous and thrifty masters of the Altay's land, on behalf of the whole country.

Valentina Lukinichna Ilyuticheva is distinguished by her exceptional diligence. A native of Sakhalin, she has devoted herself to her work in stockraising and is an exemplary milking machine operator. Here is just one example from her many years of work: Last year, nearly 50 cows were allocated to her and the average annual yield per cow was more than 5,700 kg. And that was achieved not in the center, where there are agricultural scientific institutes in the vicinity, but on Sakhalin, which is a long way from Moscow.

The award recipients include Aleksandr Ivanovich Biryulin, a representative of the working class. He has been a lathe operator for over 40 years now, and throughout those years, he has demonstrated that the lathe operator's trade is a creative one. He has mastered all kinds of lathes and earned a reputation as a specialist capable of dealing with complex technical questions by himself. His task is to produce the finest precision-made parts, which requires an individual approach and high skill. A thorough professional and a demanding educator of young people, he is one of those men of whom we can proudly say: He is a credit to our working class.

Marina Timofeyevna Semenova, ballet teacher at the USSR Bolshoy Theater, is now a Hero of Labor. She is famed as ballerina and teacher. She conducts a class now where you can see a great number of stars alongside young soloists. Wherever Marina Semenova is, there is always an atmosphere of creativity. That was true of the dozens of ballets in which she performed, and such an atmosphere is apparent today as she continues to work as a coach in the Soviet theater.

I should like to congratulate you all, dear heroes, on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sends you his congratulations. I wish you new successes!

Today is a memorable and joyous day for you. Many of you have traveled several thousand kilometers to be here in this hall in the Kremlin. I should like you all to take from here not only pleasant memories of this ceremonial moment but also a new charge of energy which you will convey to your collectives, friends, acquaintances, and relatives.

I sincerely congratulate you all once again on your awards!

A.A. Gromyko's speech was greeted with applause.

I.Ye. Zanin spoke on behalf of the award recipients. He said:

Esteemed Andrey Andreyevich!

Dear Comrades!

Permit me on behalf of the award recipients to express our profound gratitude to the Communist Party Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government for the high appreciation of our modest labor. We will spare neither strength nor health to increase the production of output still further and to improve Soviet people's life. (applause)

T.N. Mentshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the award presentation.

Ryzhkov, Talyzin Inspect Goods Exhibition

PM2806132388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Exhibition Visit"]

[Text] The exhibition of goods produced by the subsidiary production facilities and cottage industries of kolkhozes and sovkhozes set up at the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements is arousing keen interest among visitors and particularly among specialists.

The development of subsidiary production facilities and cottage industries is one of the many manifestations of the progressive changes taking place in the national economy. It is following the economic policy formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums.

N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, visited the exhibition 25 June.

During the viewing of the exhibits from the union republics, which were displaying various goods, it was noted that the level of industrial production output, amounting to R25 billion, reached on kolkhozes and sovkhozes does not accord with today's demands and potential. This amount can be increased by approximately one third by 1990 with effective assistance from industrial enterprises and the provision of equipment and materials for kolkhozes and sovkhozes and also with the development of their own initiative and activity.

In conversation with leaders and specialists of a number of collectives producing food and industrial goods, in particular sewn and fur goods which are not inferior in quality to similar goods produced by industrial enterprises, N.I. Ryzhkov gave a high assessment of their output, which is in great demand by the population.

A detailed conversation took place at the stands of collectives producing local construction materials. The revival and increase of these production facilities could become a serious step in resolving social problems in the countryside and primarily in developing individual housing construction. The output of kolkhoz and sovkhoz furniture shops attracts particular attention.

Unfortunately, not all the country's republics and regions are paying proper attention to this important trend in economic activity. The exhibition also makes it possible to come to this conclusion. In this connection a number of critical remarks were aimed at the agro-industrial committees of the Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics which have at their disposal sufficient manpower reserves and resources of local raw materials. Only R30-100 per worker per annum of subsidiary production facilities' and cottage industry output is being sold on these republics' kolkhozes and sovkhozes in comparison to R470 as a whole throughout the country.

Agricultural cooperatives of the CEMA member countries are also participating in the exhibition. One of the largest exhibits is displayed by the "Slusovice" agricultural combine cooperative (CSSR). The advantages of undertaking agricultural production in conjunction with industrial production were clearly demonstrated here.

The development of subsidiary industrial production facilities and cottage industry together with the broad use of cooperative potential, of lease, collective, and family contracts, and the advantages of other progressive forms of organizing production and labor—these are the most important trends in increasing the efficiency of the powerful potential created in the country's agro-industrial complex.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers also became acquainted with the exhibits at the construction industry pavilion—apartment blocks for rural areas, samples of new construction materials, and also progressive technological processes in construction.

The following took part in inspecting the exhibition: N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and Yu.P. Batalin, I.S. Belousov, and V.K. Gusev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Ligachev, Zaykov, Nikonov Visit Georgian Center

LD2706215588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read TASS report]

[Excerpts] The Georgian cultural and trading center, (Mziyuriy), which opened this year, is operating successfully on the Arbat in Moscow. [passage omitted]

The (Mziyuriy) cultural and trading center was visited today by Comrades Zaykov, Ligachev, and Nikonov. They were accompanied by the first secretaries of the Communist Party Central Committees and chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of the Union Republics who have come for the 19th all-union party conference. They familiarized themselves with the activities of the cultural center, which has won great popularity in Moscow in a short period of time, which helps people to understand the culture and everyday life of the Georgian people, and which serves as a means of strengthening friendship. The republic leaders gave a high appraisal of the activities of the Georgian cultural center and supported the proposal to set up in Moscow similar friendship centers for the entire union republic. The Moscow soviet is currently drawing up proposals for the location of these. They will all be architecturally unique and reflect the national traditions of the fraternal republics.

Zaykov Attends Institute Theses Discussion

PM2806150188 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 88 p 1

[MOSTASS report: "The Potential of Science—for Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] A businesslike and keen discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference has become widespread in the capital's party organizations and labor collectives.

The party and economic aktiv of the Automatic Apparatus Scientific Research Institute held a debate in a constructive and democratic atmosphere 8 June. L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in it. [passage omitted]

There was talk about enhancing the role of deputies in soviets at all levels, about constitutional guarantees of glasnost and democratization, and about strict adherence to the principle of social justice. There was particularly sharp discussion of questions concerning the implementation of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association) and economic accountability in the sphere of science.

The progress of scientific developments and the working and living conditions of the scientific research institute's collective were examined. The great importance of enhancing the efficiency of research and development, accelerating the introduction of its results in production, and improving the institute's social and consumer services base was noted.

PRAVDA Reports Demichev Award Presentation

PM2806100988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Awards Presented"]

[Text] P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presented USSR awards to participants in the Calgary 15th Winter Olympics in the Kremlin 25 June.

Orders of Lenin were presented to V.A. Ivanov, honored trainer of the USSR; and V.A. Fetisov, honored master of sports of the USSR.

Orders of the October Revolution were awarded to R.P. Smetanina, honored master of sport of the USSR; and V.V. Tikhonov, honored trainer of the USSR.

Orders of the Labor Red Banner, the Friendship of the Peoples, the "Badge of Honor," and the "For Labor Valor" and "For Labor Excellence" medals were also presented.

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government P.N. Demichev cordially congratulated the award recipients and wished them good health, happiness, and new sporting achievements.

The award recipients expressed cordial gratitude to the Communist Party and the Soviet state for this high assessment of their activity.

Sol ...ev at Launch of Leningrad Housing Plan

PM2806092388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "An Individual Apartment for Every Family"]

[Text] Leningrad—The "Leningrad. Housing-2000" Comprehensive Program was ratified at a city soviet session held yesterday. This document, which was submitted to Leningraders for discussion long before the session, determines specific measures guaranteeing each family a separate apartment or individual house by the year 2000.

In 70 years of Soviet power, approximately 60 million square meters of housing have been constructed in the city on the Neva—more than three times what there was in prerevolutionary Petersburg. However, approximately 1.5 million Leningraders out of a population of 5 million still live in communal apartments and many, especially young people, live in hostels.

The session discussed the problems of intensifying the work of the design and construction complex and of building up its capacities. It has been decided to expand the practice of enlisting industrial enterprises and contract organizations under ministries and departments in the construction of apartment blocks and social, cultural, and consumer amenities. Deputies concentrated special attention on questions of improving the system of housing distribution based on principles of social justice and consideration for the opinion of labor collectives.

Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningrad party obkom, took part in the work of the session.

Tatliyev Addresses Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet

PM2806154088 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 18 Jun 88 pp 1, 3

["Report by S.B. Tatliyev, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium," delivered at 17 June Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet session]

[Text] Comrade deputies! On 13 June the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a document of exceptional importance—the resolution "On the Petition of Deputies of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies for the Transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR."

The need to adopt this document was dictated both by the formulation of the question and by the situation that has evolved in this connection.

I do not think there is any need to go into detail about the chronology of these events, since the deputies have witnessed them throughout these months and keenly experienced everything that has happened.

Before adopting the resolution in question, at the Supreme Soviet Presidium session we examined all aspects of the matter in detail, with the utmost thoroughness and responsibility. Here we were guided steadfastly by the provisions and conclusions contained in the appeal of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the working people and the peoples of the Azerbaijan SSR and the Armenian SSR and by the party and state documents adopted in connection with events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh, documents which set forth, most responsibly, direct answers to the questions that have arisen.

The Presidium members proceeded on the basis of the internationalist interests of the entire population living in the oblast and the republic and were guided by the Leninist principles of strengthening the friendship and fraternal ties of the Azerbaijan and Armenian peoples and by the need to preserve the territorial integrity of the Azerbaijan SSR.

However, comrades, on 15 June, at a session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, a resolution was adopted giving consent for Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to join the Armenian SSR and containing an appeal on this question to the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

In this situation the Supreme Soviet Presidium had no alternative but to submit this appeal for consideration by the Azerbaijan SSR's supreme organ of state power—the Supreme Soviet; although it should be stated quite decisively that the resolution of this question cannot come within the competence of the Armenian SSR, but is completely and utterly the inalienable sovereign right of our republic and our people.

Comrade deputies! Great October laid the foundations for the resolution of the nationalities question in our country. The historic achievements of the Leninist nationalities policy were reflected in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress, the new edition of the CPSU Program, and the materials of Central Committee plenums and were set forth profoundly and comprehensively in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the ceremonial session devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October.

However, the results of the transforming work done by the Communist Party in the sphere of national relations should not create the impression that relations between nations are problem-free.

To our great regret, events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and their echoes in Yerevan, Sumgait, and other cities are still proving that.

The causes of the negative phenomena that have surfaced in our republic in the field of relations between nations, phenomena that run counter to the very spirit of Soviet patriotism and internationalist principles, go back to the years of stagnation and are connected with the accumulation of unresolved vital problems, bureaucratic distortions, and the stepped-up activity of antisocial elements under these conditions.

In a number of cases political tact and the ethos of relations between nations were lacking. It may also be noted with regret that certain leading party, soviet, and economic workers in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast helped to kindle negative sentiments and give them a mass nature.

Both in the oblast and in republican organs, there was laxity, laggardness, and underestimation of the events taking place, which led to dangerous consequences in some cases.

In those critical days the appeal of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples rang out as the voice of all our party, as the voice of the peoples of all the Soviet republics, disturbed by what had happened.

The Supreme Soviet Presidiums of all the union republics appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and to us to use our influence and all constitutional rights and opportunities to impose order and calm. This important document reflected not only the general concern at the state of affairs in the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSR's and anxiety for the fate of the mutual relations of not only the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples, it also expressed a sense of responsibility for the immutability and indissolubility of the fraternal family of all the poples of our multinational socialist state.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution on this question noted that the situation that has arisen is damaging to the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia and in general to the further strengthening of the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union as a united multinational state.

The Soviet state and the party use the territory of our socialist fatherland rationally and in the interests of the whole country and all the Soviet nations and ethnic groups, and regard it as the people's common asset.

Our territorial structure cannot be determined solely by the national composition of the population. The fundamental principle is Lenin's tenet that "...the national composition of the population is a very important economic factor, but not the only one and not the most important.... Therefore Marxists should not rely completely and utterly on the 'national territorial' principle."

It was on the basis of precisely this principled Leninist tenet that the question of the status of Nagorno-Karabakh was originally resolved.

The question of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and the position of the region under the conditions of the Soviet system received its optimum solution together with the birth of the Azerbaijan SSR. Account was taken of the totality of the conditions of historical development, existing economic ties, and the social, cultural, and living conditions and vital interests of all the peoples of the autonomous oblast.

The formation of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within the Azerbaijan SSR took place in the context of the implementation of the Communist Party's nationalities policy and in accordance with the Leninist principles of the USSR's national state system, and was of great significance in further strengthening the friendship of the fraternal Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples.

This is also indicated by all the many years' history of Nagorno-Karabakh, which has achieved large-scale successes in economic and cultural building over the past years. Formerly a remote mountainous area, Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast has become a developed industrial and agrarian region of Azerbaijan.

In accordance with the USSR Constitution and the Azerbaijan SSR Constitution, the legal status of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast is now defined by the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Law, adopted 16 June 1981, on the submission of the oblast soviet, by the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet, and makes it possible in practice to fully satisfy the economic, social, and spiritual needs of representatives of all the nations and ethnic groups of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Naturally, in the process of society's renewal and democratization, questions have emerged that have not been fully resolved, arising from the qualitatively new condition of sociopolitical life in the autonomous oblast. The resolution adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on 24 March 1988 "On Measures To Accelerate the Socioeconomic Development of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR in 1988-1995" and the measures being implemented by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the republic Council of Ministers create all the conditions for resolving all the questions.

In the course of discussion in the Presidium, the opinion was expressed unanimously that the question of Nagorno-Karabakh has been raised without justification, contrary to the preservation of the historically existing unity of the whole of Karabakh, an age-old Azerbaijani land, without consideration of the interests of citizens of all nationalities living in the oblast, and contrary to the wishes of the majority of the republic's population.

The formulation of the question of the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh has itself done serious damage to the unity and cohesion of the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples and the fraternal friendship of the USSR's peoples, given rise to serious violations of public order and individual rights, and created considerable difficulties in the implementation of the policy of restructuring and revolutionary transformations of socioeconomic life in the republic.

The question of the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR is not of local significance, it profoundly touches the interests and sovereign rights of the Azerbaijan SSR and is linked directly to the interests of the USSR—a united federal multinational state—and its national state system.

Comrades, the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee is currently devoting the keenest attention to the state of relations between nations and international education in the republic. Active work has also begun in tackling the social problems that had accumulated over the years, including food, housing, and ecological problems. Questions of cadre policy, health care, and culture have been raised searchingly. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo gives the republican party organization great, all-around assistance. The speech of Comrade Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee plenum contains a profound analysis of the state of affairs in all sphere of Azerbaijan's public life, including the problems that have arisen over Nagorno-Karabakh.

Allow me, comrade deputies, to express confidence that the republican party organization, soviet, public, and economic organs, and our body of deputies will work still more persistently and purposefully to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the republic's working people and will improve their activity in every way in the sphere of relations between nations and international education.

Comrade deputies! In submitting for your examination the question of the transfer of the oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium asks you to discuss it with the utmost thoroughness and make your authoritative decision on it.

Armenian First Secretary Meets Yerevan Citizens

PM2606153988 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 12 Jun 88 p 1

[ARMENPRESS report: "Meeting With Yerevan's Residents"]

[Text] S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, went to Yerevan's Theater Square 11 June. He met the city's residents who had assembled there.

A frank conversation took place about the complex situation which has developed in the republic and the serious problems which have accumulated. There was talk about the progress of restructuring and the Armenian party organization's efforts to overcome the major shortcomings in the economy and the social, ideological, and moral spheres which cause justified dissatisfaction among working people.

During the conversations Yerevan's citizens pointed out that stagnation phenomena occur in the republic, the struggle being waged against bribery, speculation, and protectionism is not effective, and there is no proper exactingness toward leadership cadres.

The complex tasks which have accumulated, Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan said, can be solved with the active participation of the broad masses, in conditions of glasnost. The upcoming Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum will comprehensively analyze the state of affairs in the party organization and in the republic as a whole. A principled assessment will be made of all negative phenomena which put the brakes on restructuring, and a program of specific actions will be elaborated. Yerevan's residents have expressed readiness to back the efforts by the republic's new leadership to impose proper order and extricate the republic from the crisis situation.

Party organizations and labor collectives, Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan went on to say, are now continuing their active discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, which will elaborate a program for the acceleration of restructuring processes, for economic and social development, for Soviet society's further democratization, and for the development of interethnic relations.

The first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee was asked numerous questions concerning Nagorno-Karabakh. It was explained to those assembled that this problem is being comprehensively examined by the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government. Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan reminded them that a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo instructed the Central Committee Secretariat to organize a profound and comprehensive study of the problems accumulated in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and of the causes of the exacerbation of interethnic relations around it, to work out appropriate proposals, and to submit them as they are elaborated for examination by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Government. The well-known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the acceleration of the oblast's socioeconomic development is a confirmation of real concern for Nagorno-Karabakh.

Those assembled were told about the measures being taken in Armenia to house in the Armenian SSR the families which have arrived from Sumgait. The question of the permanent residence of more than 508 families has already been resolved. The question of transferring to republic VUZ's 194 students from Azerbaijan who have expressed a desire to continue their studies in Armenia is being solved.

Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan answered numerous questions in connection with the forthcoming session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, which will examine the resolution of the extraordinary session of the NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies on applying to the Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR Supreme Soviets for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR.

During the conversation Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan noted that the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum on nationalities policy problems will determine the way to solve many complex questions we have inherited from the past. They will be examined comprehensively, in the interests of our multinational state and with due consideration for the processes of revolutionary renewal under way in the country.

The majority of participants in the conversations expressed understanding and support for the measures being taken by the CPSU Central Committee and the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee to normalize the situation prevailing around Nagorno-Karabakh.

In this context, Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan emphasized in particular that every resident in the republic must now display more self-possession and good sense than ever before. It is necessary to maintain discipline, exemplary public order, normal labor rhythm, and a calm and stable situation everywhere. It is very important to ensure that the exercise of broad democratic rights and freedoms does not get out of control and does not cause complications in the life of the republic capital. A display of civic maturity and lofty responsibility would be in line with the statewide interests of our multinational country and of the republic's entire population.

The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee banks on the political awareness of the working class, the intelligentsia, the student youth, and all residents of the capital.

Yerevan's working people stated their ardent support for the party's course of restructuring, renewal, and development of democracy and glasnost and assured the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee that they will greet the forthcoming 19th All-union Party Conference with patriotic labor and specific deeds.

Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan was accompanied by F.T. Sarkisyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers; Yu.P. Kochetkov, second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; and L.G. Saakyan, first secretary of the Yerevan Armenian Communist Party Gorkom.

Latvian Resolution Focuses on Nationalism

PM2906153588 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 19 Jun 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Resolution of Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum on Political Situation in Republic"]

[Text] The profound revolutionary transformations being effected in the country on the party's initiative have given a major boost to working people's sociopolitical activeness. It is especially noticeable on the eve of the 19th all-union party conference.

Our republic, like the entire country, is experiencing a crucial time in its development. The people's awakened social awareness is assessing the historical past, the present, and the future and is scaling new heights of civic-mindedness, critical analysis, and quest for ways to solve the problems accumulated during the years of stagnation.

Now is the time for heated arguments and sharp debates, a period of abolition of past stereotypes and attitudes, when socialist pluralism of opinions can be experienced in practice.

The working people are becoming more profoundly aware that restructuring cannot produce immediate solutions to the entire complex of tasks. What is needed are selfless labor, creativity, and energy by absolutely everyone.

All these are positive results of restructuring.

But it is impossible not to perceive the recent emergence of trends toward complicating the political situation in the republic. Communists and working people are seriously worried about the relapses into nationalism, chauvinism, and anti-Sovietism. The 14 June rally in Riga dedicated to the noble goal of honoring the memory of the victims of Stalin's repressions was exploited for unseemly purposes by individual groups and persons with extremist leanings who displayed symbols of bourgeois Latvia and slogans of an anti-Soviet and provocative nature.

There are increasingly frequent instances of distribution of leaflets aimed at inciting interethnic enmity and calling for political confrontation.

Some self-motivated socially oriented public organizations are increasingly politicizing their activity and are deviating from their initial proclaimed objectives. Speculating on the real difficulties in restructuring processes and on national feelings, the leaders of individual formations are striving to remove people's sociopolitical activeness from the influence of party and state organs and to involve citizens in various street actions. These leaders are also setting the task of creating structural links of a political nature in the guise of informal assciations.

The republic's Communists and working people must not allow slogans in support of democratization and glasnost to be used in the interests of opposition to restructuring and destabilization of the political situation.

The Writers Union Board plenum attended by leaders of other creative unions was a substantial factor in activating social life in the republic. It demonrated the enhanced positive role of the artistic intelligentsia and its interest in solving the pressing problems of the republic's socioeconomic and spiritual life and produced a whole series of constructive proposals.

At the same time, the discussion of some key problems at the plenum was conducted without proper consideration of the interests of all social groups and nationalities in the republic. The political consequences of the proposed measures were not always duly considered. The essence of certain proposals was objectively aimed at conserving national exclusiveness. Some arguable propositions requiring further analysis and interpretation were included in the plenum resolution.

Opinions rejecting the existence of a revolutionary situation in Latvia in the summer of 1940 and questioning the legality of the restoration of Soviet power in the republic have been circulating recently.

Subjectivist interpretations of historical events, which have been irresponsibly picked up by some mass media and have not been duly rebuffed, disorient public opinion and provide a platform for the consolidation of elements with nationalist leanings.

The Central Committee plenum deems it necessary to address in particular Communists working in the mass media and all journalists. The party highly values their role in the work to implement revolutionary restructuring and create a new moral atmosphere in society. But journalists sometimes lack the ability to demonstrate the sheer complexity and gravity of the tasks that are being resolved. Published material and television programs often contain superficial assessments of past and current events alike, and authors are guilty of inaccuracies bordering on half-truths.

Any distortion of reality in published material is a blow against glasnost and restructuring. Anyone who fails to realize this cannot work in the mass media. The press, as V.I. Lenin said on many occasions, is a partywide concern; it cannot be the blind executant of someone's unseemly designs.

Questions of the party's nationalities policy are not always covered from the standpoint of political consideration and factual accuracy, and this damages the cause of international and patriotic education.

Sometimes a principled assessment is not made of Communists who breach party discipline and the norms of internal party life.

The plenum deems it important to emphasize that the solution of any problems, including interethnic problems, must be approached from comprehensive consideration of the needs and interests of the various national, social, and demographic groups of the republic's population.

Consistently upholding the principles of internationalism, Communists must display fighting qualities and political vigilance, must take a resolute stand against any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, and must wage an implacable struggle against lack of culture and national arrogance.

Both national nihilism and the ideology and mentality of national superiority and arrogance are unacceptable to Communists. It is necessary to proceed in everything from the premise that personal responsibility for shaping a healthy moral and psychological climate in collectives rests primarily with top leaders.

Soviet and law enforcement organs must ensure public order and strict observance of citizens' constitutional rights everywhere.

The plenum deems it a task of paramount importance to resolutely overcome the situation whereby pressing questions of supplying the population with foodstuffs, housing, and everyday goods are resolved unsatisfactorily, measures to improve ecological conditions are implemented impermissibly slowly, and the struggle against administrative edict methods of management and bureaucratism is waged feebly. It is in these matters that

cadres can demonstrate their ability to ensure unity of words and deeds, which is the basis for enhancing the efficiency of ideological work.

Party committees and organizations must learn profound lessons from recent events and the political situation prevailing in the republic, must resolutely restructure their entire organizational, ideological, and educational work, must overcome sluggishness and social inertia, must display resoluteness and principledness in upholding the revolutionary ideals, must learn to work with the masses, and must be skilled in talking to people and using the truth to convince them.

The plenum calls on Communists and nonparty members, workers, kolkhoz members, the intelligentsia, and representatives of all nationalities to consolidate and pool their efforts on the principled platform of restructuring, for the sake of accelerating the socioeconomic development of the republic and the country as a whole.

Latvian Writers Union Resolution Published
PM2706110388 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 11 Jun 88 pp 2-3

["Resolution of the Plenum of the Writers Union Board With the Participation of Leaders of the Unions of Architects, Designers, Artists, Cinematographers, Composers, Theatrical Figures, Journalists, and Experts"—first three paragraphs are statement by departments of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee]

[Excerpt] The plenum of the Latvian Writers Union board held on 1-2 June this year with the participation of leaders of other creative unions of the republic demonstrated the high level of social activeness and civic interest of the republic's artistic intelligentsia in intensifying the revolutionary nature of restructuring. The discussion at the plenum, the keen criticism of stagnation phenomena, the analysis of their causes, and the different approaches and proposals on the renewal of all aspects of our society's life and the democratization of party and state activity are the practical manifestation of the assertion of glasnost and of democratic forms for the expression of the views of representatives of the artistic and scientific public. The theses, assessments, and proposals contained in the resolution reflect the viewpoint of the Writers Union board and the leaders of the republic's creative unions on important problems of the development of the Lettish socialist nation. Their opinions and constructive ideas deserve all-around support and consideration in the practical work of party and state organs and ideological institutions. At the same time, a number of proposals set forth in the resolution are debatable, and it is hard to agree with them; they must be analyzed attentively from the viewpoint of their combination of republican and statewide interests, their consideration of the interests of inhabitants of all nationalities, categories, and strata of the republic's population, and also of the sociopolitical consequences of the measures proposed in the resolution.

Scientists and competent specialists of various sectors of the national economy must engage in this, taking into account the opinions of the labor collectives. Their conclusions will be published in the press and submitted for examination to the republic's leading party and state organs.

The materials of the plenum of the board of the republic's Writers Union are an important impetus to the activation of sociopolitical thought, the resolute overcoming of stereotypes in ideological work, and the solution of urgent problems of the republic's economic, ecological, demographic, sociopolitical, and spiritual development. The plenum's constructive ideas will be reflected in a concept for the republic's socioeconomic development through the year 2005, which is being elaborated.

Riga, 2 June 1988—Having heard the reports from members of the Latvian SSR creative unions and the specially invited experts on the subject "Topical Problems of Soviet Latvia's Culture on the Eve of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference," the plenum is coming out with the following conclusions, problems revealed, and constructive proposals.

The radical reforms in the field of the economy, glasnost, democratization, and the new thinking, which are promoting the transformation of socialism's appearance and which accord with truly scientific premises and ethical ideals, must be considered the main and decisive things at the present historical stage.

The course of restructuring must be considered the only guarantee both of the commonality of the entire USSR and of the national statehood of each union republic.

Support must be given to the policy elaborated as a result of the initiative of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, doing the utmost to promote its implementation.

The appeal against the course of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost must be viewed as an attack on socialism, internationalism, the peoples' national rights, and the right of each citizen individually.

During restructuring, support must be given to the public's consistent efforts for the radical reorganization of the elections system and the further democratization of party life, the role of the soviets of people's deputies must be fundamentally enhanced in the full implementation of the measures set forth in the CPSU Central Committee Theses, and the soviets must be turned into fully empowered organs for resolving state matters.

Proposals for the promotion of nonparty people to leading work as well must be supported.

In elaborating historical concepts, we must resolutely renounce Stalinist interpretations which continue to harm the Soviet people, including the Lettish people, and Latvia's history. It must be noted that Latvia's entry into the Soviet Union and the point of its existence within the USSR were compromised by the conditions of the Stalin personality cult.

The attempt after the 20th party congress to return in Latvia to a more or less sovereign economic and social policy was halted in 1959 by the alleged exposure of so-called nationalism, which intensified still further the extensive development of the economy in the republic.

In this connection, support should be given to the proposal voiced at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee May (1988) Plenum for reassessing the content and conclusions of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee July (1959) Plenum.

We must learn to look the truth in the eye, however difficult and sometimes bitter it may be. Otherwise, all our present hopes are inevitably doomed.

Aspects of the Republic's Status and Rights [subhead]

We must demand the legislative and practical restoration of Lenin's concept of the union republic. It must be considered that apart from general formulations in the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions, our republic's state laws have failed to find a clear definition and exposition in legislation. The Latvian SSR's participation in the USSR's economic and social development is taking place not on the basis of the equitable principle of a sovereign state within an alliance of free states; this has led to the point where the indigenous people of Latvia—the Letts—are becoming a national minority within the confines of their own ethnogeographical territory.

Since this is the first time in the many centuries of the Lettish people's hard history that such a situation has been created, we urge that the conservation and development of the Lettish nation be regarded as a priority task of the Latvian Communist Party and the republic's government. In fulfilling this task, the republic's leadership and each individual citizen must at the same time ensure the observance of the principles of internationalism and respect for the rights and human dignity of the citizen of any nationality living in Latvia.

In recognizing the status of the rights of a citizen of the USSR, we must also elaborate the status of the rights of a citizen of the union republic.

We must eliminate the situation whereby rights stipulated by the Constitution cannot be enjoyed because there is no relevant law defining the method of implementing these rights.

We must achieve the strict regulation and control of the migration process. The question of every person (and his family) invited to work in Latvia from another republic must be resolved by the local soviets with a stipulation of a payment from enterprises and organizations which would cover in full all expenses on his social and municipal needs. The expenses should be backed up by the quotas for construction and installation work.

For the sake of implementing political restructuring, we urge the Latvian SSR and USSR Governments to actively implement a policy and diplomacy which will ensure that the status of the republic can in practice involve Latvia's international recognition as a sovereign and national state within the Soviet Federation. We must seek the Latvian SSR's admission to the United Nations, UNESCO, the Olympic movement, and sports and other federations with the right to take part in political, cultural, scientific, and sports forums using the state and national symbols of our sovereign republic.

We must address proposals to the Supreme Soviet on the specific solution of this question.

The radical expansion of all types of cooperation with Letts living in other republics and abroad must be regarded as something which goes without saying and which is essential. A press organ must be published in Lettish and Russian for Letts living in other republics of the USSR.

The permanent (full time) post of foreign minister must be instituted in the Latvian SSR Government, as in other union republics.

Staff permanent correspondent posts must be allocated at several major political and cultural centers abroad for representatives of the Latvian press, radio, television, and cinema.

It must be deemed essential and compulsory to seek accreditation for the Latvian SSR's press, radio, television, and cinema during visits by foreign leaders and delegations in Moscow and other cities and republics of the USSR. The same thing should apply to the recruitment of Latvian mass media workers to cover visits to foreign countries by USSR government delegations.

The right to choose freely to work and study abroad must be stipulated for citizens of the Latvian SSR.

In implementing these questions we must rely in practice on the following idea expressed in the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference:

"Decentralization and the maximum transfer locally of many management functions fully accords with all forms of our national statehood and autonomy. The unconditional fulfillment is required here of the provisions of the USSR Constitution and the Soviet laws guaranteeing the rights of the union and autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs."

The USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities must be transformed from a purely representative organ into an acting parliamentary chamber really representing and defending the interests of the nation, ethnic group, or national group, preventing measures threatening the existence of the indigenous nation and its equality, and guaranteeing the republic's genuine national statehood within the union federation.

Public opinion in the field of national relations must be constantly studied, and the public must be informed openly and regularly on the subject.

All sections of population census materials must be widely published in the press.

It is proposed that the Latvian SSR Constitution (as is the case in the Constitutions of the Georgian, Armenian, and Azerbaijan SSR's) include an article giving the Lettish language the status of the republic's state language. The Russian language, as at present, should be used as a means of inter-nation [mezhnatsionalnyy] communication, both within the republic and in the USSR as a whole. But the language of the indigenous people should become the means of inter-nation communication for the republic's inhabitants.

The mastering of other languages should be regarded as an indicator of professional suitability for work in state and soviet institutions, especially in sectors connected with the social sphere: in the sphere of health care, in educational establishments, and in public order enforcement institutions.

Opportunities must be fully ensured for receiving both primary and vocational education (secondary and higher in all the specialties studied in the republic) in the Lettish language.

Opportunities must be ensured for using the Lettish language in all spheres of the republic's material and spiritual life, including office work, thus creating the basis for the existence and development of all functional styles of the Lettish language.

The opportunity to receive education in their native language must be ensured for representatives of all other nationalities living in the republic, opening up schools or classes in places where they are concentrated. Public organizations and cultural centers must be created which would decide questions of the culture of Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Poles, Jews, Lithuanians, gypsies, and citizens of other nationalities and also of Letgales and Livs.

Measures must be implemented to overcome the cultural and social isolation of the non-Lettish population of the Latvian SSR. Every support must be given to the formation in all Latvia's national groups of a sense of being patriots of their republic and to their organic fusion into Latvia's culture. Also, support must be given to the conscious study of Latvia's history and cultural traditions and to respect for them.

The guarantee of the state law must be ensured for the proposals listed above.

Proceeding from the experience existing in the republic, we must renounce the mechanical and artificial increase in the number of schools with bilingual streams, reorganizing them only in cases where parents express a demand. The results of the experience of these schools should be studied, and the consequences of creating these schools in the formation of national relations must be analyzed.

Considering the fact that the Red Lettish Riflemen were the first and most aware section of the Red Army, and with a view to the continuity of international traditions in the Armed Forces, the possibility must be viewed of creating a military formation on the territory of the Latvian SSR (in the form of a subunit or military academy). In this formation, the function of the Lettish language and Lettish culture would be ensured alongside the Russian language.

This formation could be staffed with young people fluent in Russian and Lettish.

Attempts to replace an objective study of specific facts and events with irresponsible accusations of nationalism should be totally eliminated in the republic's political life, in the mass media, and in ideological work.

Ideological activity which fails to study the social and national dissatisfaction of the broad public strata to reveal and eradicate the cases of economic, demographic, and ecological deformations and presents them as the result of foreign propaganda, or the idea of the restoration of capitalism, should be considered intolerable and incompatible with the principles of glasnost.

We must struggle against attempts to present the emergence of national problems as the adverse consequences of the policy of restructuring.

Legislative power must be separated from executive power. A system of financial relations ensuring the soviets the necessary funds for their activity must be ensured.

Socioeconomic development plans must provided for special sections on the prevention of law violations, including crimes, with a consideration for the relevant material backup.

The statistics for crimes and other violations must be the subject of full glasnost. These statistics must be published so that the public can actively and purposefully join in the eradication of these negative phenomena.

Legislation on appealing against the decisions of officials must be altered, granting the right to dispute in court the decision of any collegiate organ and the right of leaders of any rank to defend through legal channels their right to labor (and in the event of unlawful dismissal to bring a claim for reinstatement, and so forth).

The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet must be asked to monitor more effectively the activity of the MVD and KGB and the Army, Navy, and border troops subunits effecting the republic's legal interests (in economic life, nature conservation, and so forth). The concept of state secrets, their keeping and limits must be clearly defined in legislation.

Support must be given to the proposal from the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers to the USSR Council of Ministers concerning the repeal of the 14 May 1941 resolution of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and the USSR Soviet of People's Commissars and the USSR Council of Ministers' 23 January 1949 resolution on the administrative banishment of individual groups of the population from the Baltic republics, the Western Ukraine, and Western Belorussia as illegal and counter to the USSR Constitution and as legally and morally unjustified: These resolutions were the basis for further repressions and exacted an enormous number of innocent victims. There is also an urgent need for a legislative act banning deportation.

With a view to restoring historical justice, the republic's public must be familiarized with the secret protocols of the pact signed on 23 August 1939 by Ribbentrop and Molotov.

The rehabilitation of undeservedly repressed victims of Stalin's policy organically includes the public censure of specific culprits and executors of the repressions, with criminal charges being brought against them where necessary. These people should be deprived of the social privileges allocated to them and of their honorary titles and the right to be symbols of the achievements of Soviet power (for instance, in the naming of cities, streets, educational establishments, and so forth for them).

The actual inviolability of mail communications, correspondence, and telephone conversations must be ensured.

Access to materials of the special funds in archives, museums, and libraries must be opened to a broad range of readers, as stipulated by state laws.

The term of operation of all party and state documents must be stipulated. When this term expires, the documents must be handed over to the archives, where they must also be accessible. [passage omitted]

Further on Social Impact of Brezhnev Era

PM2806130188 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 25, 20-26 Jun 88 (Signed to Press 22 Jun 88) pp 10, 11

[Second and final part of Igor Bestuzhev-Lada "Sociologist's Opinion" under the rubric "Toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "Triumphantly Marching Nowhere. The Time of Stagnation: Symptoms of the Disease"—boldface as published; first part of article was published in the 17 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 57-61]

[Text] 3.

It has been said for a long time: Every people get the rulers they deserve. I am resolutely opposed to claims that our people had useless rulers at every level of state power in the thirties, fifties, and seventies. But I believe that they nevertheless deserved better. I agree: If we continue to behave in political affairs like philistines rather than like citizens (even though we were reduced to this state rather than reducing ourselves to it), we will miss a rare chance in our history to accomplish social transformations paving the way to a better future. We will not forget that the 20th party congress was and still remains a great event in our history and that N.S. Khrushchev's speech at that congress was an act of personal courage, a civic feat. But we must not forget how the congress decisions were nullified. We must remember how this was done.

In general, the more you ponder the fate of restructuring, the more firmly you draw the conclusion: The most terrible opponents of restructuring are not only the bureaucracy of officials and dignitaries, even though it remains quite powerful to this day, but also the social freeloading we have inherited from the seventies and whose roots go back to at least the thirties. Social freeloading, political philistinism, the desire to heedlessly spend more than we have earned and then sink into meaningless verbiage, saying one thing and meaning another: "It's nothing to do with me," "I couldn't care less as long as I get my slice," and other similar attitudes—this is one of the symptoms of Brezhnevshchina which is still with us to this day.

Indeed: The living in the grip of the dead!

It is time to get rid of parasitism—time is running out, and we can no longer afford to loll around chewing the fat, the way we used to.

The same can be said about two other symptoms of the social phenomenon in question—social servility and social hypocrisy.

A journal published a short story, running to just a couple of pages. But it made a shattering impression, like a novel encompassing 60 years of life. Of my life, at any rate.

The mid-forties. A general's car, gleaming with chrome, is driving along the highway. Horn constantly blaring: Out of the way! The boss is in a hurry! And everybody jumps into the ditch in fear. It passes a few more modest cars, and the passenger in one of them quietly tells his driver in a thick Caucasian accent: Stop him, ask him to come here.

Suddenly one of the cars, accelerating with a roar, passes the general's car and blocks the road. Wild abuse from the general's driver. Even wilder abuse from the general himself, who is forced to get out of the car. Who dares do such a thing?! I'll show you!...

He suddenly sees the passenger, is struck dumb, pales, and sweat covers his forehead. In a flash, a couple of words from the passenger turn the general into a colonel. But an even more striking metamorphosis has occurred before our very eyes: In a flash, the blatant haughty lout has turned into an equally blatant servile lackey. Actually, there is nothing striking in this. It has been known for a very long time that loutishness and toadyism are two faces of the same coin, known as meanness and baseness of character of the bearer of these qualities.

Incidentally, the magician who made such metamorphoses a typical phenomenon of postrevolutionary times (everyone knows that they also used to occur before the revolution) was none other than the passenger who was capable of arbitrarily turning generals into colonels and vice versa with just a couple of words.

This short story by V. Safonov published in the journal MOSKVA (Issue No. 4, 1988) very accurately reflects an important moral aspect of our life, it educates by reminding people of human dignity in contrast with human baseness. It doesn't matter that the short story contains a certain element of poetic license. Is the incident implausible? Certainly not! A true manifestation of socialist realism: Each of us has encountered similar phenomena in the street, in the streetcar, in his own enterprise, and even in his own family. Having first emerged in the thirties, if not earlier, these phenomena became increasingly widespread in the postwar years, intensifying from decade to decade, and ultimately becoming one of the main characteristics of Brezhnevshchina, which in many respects holds us in its firm grip to this day.

One can go on and on explaining how this endless transformation of loutishness into toadyism and vice versa emerged and why it still prevails. It is reminiscent of the equally endless neutron-proton metamorphoses in the world of the atom. In that world this process releases neutrinos, in our world it creates a moral atmosphere that is far from desirable.

It is possible to complain that it is deplorable, to express noble wishes, to correctly emphasize that it is as much a brake on restructuring as social freeloading. The trouble is that many people have gotten accustomed to considering such an atmosphere as natural as, for example—begging your pardon—the atmosphere inside our public toilets (which evoke a similar state of shock in people arriving in our country for the first time to the inexplicable hostility of service personnel at the airport or the railroad terminus, in the hotel or the restaurant).

So for a start let us confine ourselves to attempting to remind those who have forgotten and inform those who do not know that loutishness-servility, like a dirty public toilet, is not in the least natural but is, on the contrary, unnatural; that fundamentally different and incomparably more humane and elevated models of relations between people exist, and that they exist also in our country.

We would be bold enough to state the following scientific hypothesis: Loutishness, arrogance, and haughtiness on the one hand, and toadyism, ingratiation, and servility on the other hand, are considered by many people to represent the natural state of affairs and are widely practiced in social life because, as sociologists say, they have been **institutionalized,** in other words, they have wrongly become a component of our morality, customs, and traditions, of the daily activity of our enterprises, establishments, and organizations, and of our social institutions in general.

It is necessary to separate the wheat from the chaff, the clean from the unclean, and the base from the elevated, to prove the shamefulness of baseness and the merit of decency. This will probably produce no miracles. But it will make it more difficult to act like a lout and more reprehensible to behave like a lackey. And once this is done, you'll see, the process of restoring human dignity will proceed spontaneously.

But first it is necessary to realize why any humiliation of human dignity is shameful not so much for the humiliated but (no matter how surprising this might seem) for the one that humiliates. And the main point is that it is fatal for society and the state. It seems that it is not always easy for everyone to realize this.

Here are a few examples from life, taken at random.

Since we started with a story about highways in the mid-forties, let us take a look and see whether anything has changed in the eighties. Here we have a State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration sergeant who has halted a small Zhiguli: You've been speeding, you've broken the rules, you ought to be ashamed of yourself!

"I was really in a hurry, it's an emergency," the Zhiguli driver tries to explain.

"Our laws apply equally to everyone!", the sergeant ponderously pronounces an absolute truth.

But, at that very moment, it appears that every absolute truth is relative, that our laws indeed apply equally to everyone but that they apply "more equally" to some. A black limousine, with a magical combination of decals and figures on its license plate, rolls along the highway breaking every single traffic regulation. And the sergeant's baton, instead of being raised to halt the violator, freezes in a servile salute.

Of course, the boss is in a hurry: affairs of state. But is the cost of speeding not a bit too high? After all, all along the road millions of people are taught a lesson in political literacy: Some people cannot, other people can, words are one thing, life is something else.

And the consequences start snowballing. We walk and even drive through red lights at the cost of a hundred lives, against just one when people move only when the lights are green. We grab anything that lies in temptation's way. We dig up a park in the city center to build ourselves a parking lot. It all ends with the familiar scenes at "grassroots" level: from the store director indulging in overbearing verbal abuse on the one hand, to the cleaner slopping a wet mop across customers' feet because she is in a hurry, on the other hand. The overall effect on the moral atmosphere in society is murderous.

We still cannot resist laughing when we read how Prince Potemkin-Tavricheskiy did a bit of window dressing for the mother-empress by building his decorative "Potemkin villages" along the route she was to follow. Here we are, exactly 200 years later. June 1988. And what is happening?

A high-ranking visitor from the capital is expected at one end of the country. And people urgently paint the corner of the port's arrivals and departure building where the guest will pass. To hell with all the rest—it will be out of sight.

A visitor from abroad is expected at the other end of the country. People urgently resurface the streets along which he is likely to travel. And on those along which he is certainly not going to travel, there are potholes that resemble craters. I look out of my apartment windows into the yard and see people urgently clearing a rubbish heap that has been part of our yard scenery for almost all the 840 years of Moscow's existence, even though the guest could wish to visit our yard only if he were out of his mind.

And as if this were not enough, an important city highway is completely blocked off for almost a week, just in case, and tens of thousands of cars rush around in different directions like blind kittens.

Prince Potemkin must be turning in his grave, unable to keep from laughing, and slyly winking at us with his one eye.

At times it seems that, were it not for anniversaries, jubilees, and visits by high-ranking guests, we would still be walking unwashed along unpaved streets with unpainted apartment blocks, port arrivals and departures buildings, and so on. Yes, Potemkinshchina is the great-grandmother of Brezhnevshchina when it comes to servility and ostentation. Parting company with this seemingly deceased relative who is so tenacious of life must be an important aspect of society's renewal.

Can you imagine a master of ceremonies in the 19th century introducing, say, Shchepkin or Mochalov [19th century Russian actors] to the most esteemed public, and saying in a well modulated voice:

"No-o-w we give the floor to the hereditary nobleman, full state councillor, oberhofkammerfuehrer of His Majesty, guards cavalry staff captain of the reserve, owner of Khlyupino Village, Poshekhonskiy Uyezd, Yaroslavl Guberniya...."

Gibberish. Nonscience-fiction....

But is this any better:

"No-o-w we give the floor to the people's... honored... hero... winner of... winner of..."

And this is to distinguish him from the speakers to come, those who are the non-people's, non-honored, non-heroic, non-crowned and so on "small fry."

How is it possible to classify artists, painters, and figures of the arts in general by rank, like naval captains? How is it possible to elevate one and thus denigrate another in advance, even before they have spoken? Since time immemorial, things like this have happened only in the circus. But all of art and all of culture cannot be turned into a circus! Chekhov was only joking when he humorously classified Russian writers according to the table of ranks. But we have taken his joke seriously. When the honorary title of "People's" was introduced, it was assumed that this would be in recognition of the merits of an artist who had really gained nationwide recognition. But what happened? We have titles which are awarded behind closed doors, frequently without anyone knowing on what basis.

What is the ultimate result? An atmosphere in some theaters and creative unions reminiscent of that in communal kitchens in the past, a domination by mediocrity without precedent.

Is it possible to divide the country's scientists into first-rate and second-rate? It might be possible to divide them into scientists and pseudoscientists, "para-scientists." But genuine science, like sturgeon—as Bulgakov's Voland claimed—can and must always be nothing but fresh, first-rate.

And yet it seems that such a division is possible, if some are styled full members while others are styled not quite full, just corresponding or something. And if, furthermore, the criterion for the division is made vague and entirely dependent on the group views held by the "full" and "not quite full" members, it will be easy to turn a scientific research institute into a troublesome communal kitchen, like any theater. With the same results.

Meanwhile, in order to become even a "not quite full" member, you have to at least defend a candidate's and a doctor's dissertation, which takes up the most creative years of a scientist's life. Hundreds of scathing articles have been written on the nature of dissertations and their defense in their present form. It has been said and proved hundreds of times: There is a very real corruption of young scientists whose consequences are catastrophic for science. And what is happening? Why, nothing, everything remains as it was under Lomonosov (the only difference being that Lomonosov is no longer around).

Here are just two figures describing the ultimate result of the stagnation of science in the conditions of Brezhnevshchina: Scientific workers in our country represent 25 percent of the total number of scientists in the world, but references to their works (in other words, indications that someone has at least read them) account for only 1.75 percent of all references. Fifteen times fewer. At the level of India or Brazil, which have considerably fewer scientists. Figuratively speaking, the efficiency of our average scientific worker's labor is 15 times lower than the top standard. Or, and this amounts to the same thing, only 1 in every 15 scientific research institute staffers works properly in science.

This is the ultimate cost of the "pecking order" in science.

We have heard our scientific and cultural figures (incidentally, why do we have this strange division—does the one preclude the other, or what?) utter various ardent words about production efficiency, about environmental protection, and about the proud title of "man."

But not a single one of them has uttered a single word to the effect that he is a member of a privileged caste organization, which has various names but essentially just one goal: to gain considerable advantages and build a thick wall, like that of a medieval castle, to fence themselves off from the public, which lacks these advantages. Nor will they ever utter such words: This is what caste is all about, this is what privileges are all about.

We have already mentioned the fatal consequences of this system for science, for literature, and for art alike. Let us add just one more thing. History has confirmed the correctness of this axiom: Just as a people who oppress other peoples can never be free, by an extension of this same logic a man who denigrates another man cannot have a creative and, generally speaking, real personality. Every master is always someone's slave. At least the slave of an obsolete order.

This is one of the terrifying and instructive lessons of Brezhnevshchina. At "the top" there is haughty arrogance and toadyism, Potemkinshchina, caste attitudes, privileges. And what about "the bottom"? Can the "bottom" avoid imitating the "top" and behave in a fundamentally different manner? Of course it cannot!

And yet we are amazed to learn about "bullying" in the army, about new conscripts being scoffed at by "old-timers." A disgrace which is equal to the disgrace of a lost war against the weakest of opponents! (Even though it is being diligently covered up by "Potemkins" in uniform.) Morals compared to which Pomyalovskiy's seminarists [reference to 19th century "Seminary Sketches" by N.G. Pomyalovskiy castigating callousness and cruelty in religious seminaries] look like graduates from the Institute for the Daughters of the Nobility. But how will such morals stand up at the time of harsh trials should, God forbid, such trials have to be faced?

But why feel amazed and bitter? The army is a carbon copy of society. We know that something similar happens in some schools and vocational and technical schools. In their own turn, the nasty school and "votech" morals are firmly rooted in apartment block yards and passages (let us go no further back than Kazan's West Side Story of almost 100 teenage gangster gangs, which shocked us only recently), in "underprivileged" families and externally "prosperous" collectives where the "right of might" still reigns, where everything is run according to the principle: "I'm the boss, you're stupid, and vice versa."

In other words, "bullying" in the army is an ugly reflection of the perverted human relations between us, between you and me, who are long past draft age; it is a harmful caricature of the loutishness-servility atmosphere that we still must experience.

It is of course true that haughty arrogance and servility do not emerge automatically, that they are the offspring and inevitable consequence of the system of bureaucratic centralism. This is why it is necessary to go down to the root. And any hacking must be done at root level. It is, however, also true that hacking may turn into a pat on the head (or the ax may fall in the wrong place) unless there is careful examination of the specific phenomena of loutishness, arrogance, conceit, toadyism, ingratiation, and servility in their "institutionalized" packaging of privileged caste organizations and a medieval hierarchy of titles and ranks.

People must be made to feel ashamed at being honored not for their labor but for their title. They must be made to feel ashamed at ingratiating themselves with anyone at all. Maybe the conception of such a sense of shame will be one of the starting points for the moral transformation of society, for the resolute extirpation of Brezhnevshchina from it?

"What on earth is going on?", a pensioner who was raised on press and television reports from past decades angrily asks in a letter to NEDELYA. "It is impossible to switch on the television or open a newspaper or journal: Ships are sinking, trains are derailed, airplanes are crashing on takeoff and landing alike, there are tens of thousands killed and hundreds of thousands injured on the roads every year, just like in wartime; brutal crimes are apparently committed—and what crimes!—apartments burned down, children drowned, abuse of—whom do you think?—ministers! The end of the world is coming! What has happened? How come none of this went on even a few years ago, on the contrary, no matter when you switched on or what paper you looked at, you would come across nothing but prolonged applause, and if anyone was abused, it was only a janitor, a switchman, or, in extreme cases, a house manager...."

It must be explained to the reader that exactly the same things—and sometimes even worse—also happened in the past. Battleships capsized, entire oblasts fell into a state of neglect, while ministers and even higher ranking chiefs were not only abused—they were kicked out like naughty kids (Brezhnev, by the way, was never inhibited in this regard, especially if he saw someone as a possible rival), while earlier still they were shot without either trial or investigation. But all that was done quietly, without distressing the public with sad news.

Secrecy, the exact opposite of glasnost, reigned. Social hypocrisy—which emerged simultaneously with the personality cult but finally took shape and flourished luxuriantly in the seventies—reigned.

The policy of social hypocrisy bore its fruit: There grew up several generations of people who wished to know nothing about the terrors of Stalinshchina, the convulsions of Khrushchevshchina, or the senility of Brezhnevshchina. And they were not only pensioners, they were also students and school pupils!

"Stop publishing accident reports," a young woman reader wrote to the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS. "I am afraid that someone might beat me up, rob me, or kill me. I can't sleep!"

This is what we have come to! Ostriches with their heads in the sand, gutless people, like the Eloi from "The Time Machine" (no, not the one by Andrey Makarevich but the one by someone called Herbert Wells) joyfully dancing round and round, trying not to pay attention (oh, how disgusting!) to the fact that every now and then one of their number is dragged away by a terrifying Morlock informer to his slaughterhouse, these Eloi who are proper heroes compared with the dear girl nurtured on Brezhnevshchina. And is she the only one of her kind—the only product of her time? How about us? Are we any better? Are we different?

Social hypocrisy is terrifying not only because words differ from deeds and it is the cause (in other words the economy and culture) that primarily suffers as a result, but also because the divergence of words and deeds inevitably deforms personality and leads to its degradation, and this aggravates further still the degradation of the economy and culture. Thus here we suffer losses in two directions at the same time—the losers are society as a whole, as well as its component individuals, especially the growing generation.

Hypocrisy is also dangerous because it makes people, including their leaders, shut their eyes to the problems facing society. Thus problems "emerge" suddenly, like tsunami, and they have to be solved with great effort and at a high cost which could be much lower if only we marched forward with our eyes open and considered the possible consequences of the decisions we make.

4.

Some 20 years ago, when it finally became clear that the essence of modern forecasting lies indeed in this type of "consideration," the author of these lines spent much time and energy on setting up an appropriate scientific service. It turned out, however, that this was just another utopia since the administrative edict system **does not need** scientific substantiation of decisions (a simulacrum of such substantiation—for decency's sake, to pretend that everything is just the way it is elsewhere—is a different matter).

As a matter of fact, such substantiation is actually contraindicated because it undermines the predominant authoritarian principle of management. Objective conditions for the scientific substantiation of policy—and simultaneously for ridding it from hypocrisy—are being essentially created only now, in the course of restructuring.

It is curious tha the danger of social hypocrisy was realized also in the years of stagnation. Resolutions condemning "political blather" were adopted on many occasions and at the highest level throughout the seventies. But these resolutions proved to be nothing but hot air, because bureaucratic centralism is unimaginable without social hypocrisy, and even more so without social demagoguery. Hypocrisy and demagoguery are mandatory trappings for a bureaucrat when he addresses **the population.** Like the equally mandatory suit, shirt, and necktie.

Let us examine the methods by which social hypocrisy took root in our life.

There are three basic methods: Unjustified secrecy, arbitrary censorship, and unpardonable lies. It is hard to say which is worst. Let us briefly dwell on each in turn.

Look at how much formerly sensational information is appearing today, without any sensationalism, in the pages of the press and on the television screen. Starting with liters of alcohol consumed per capita (which only 3 years ago was fraught with "severe" punishment) and ending with who has how many missiles of what range and of what kind—things that were always known to the whole world except us. And what happened? Nothing. The world has not turned upside down.

Furthermore, we have at long last an opportunity to contrast "our" data and "theirs." Which has only reinforced our positions. But it would be an exaggeration to say that an end has been put to unjustified secrecy. Stupid "taboos" still exist—plenty of them. At times they take sophisticated and even simply ludicrous forms.

For example, how can anyone understand anything from our official communiques (take your pick from almost any of them)? Reading a newspaper report, you often think: Surely they did not get together to waste so much time only **for this** (which has been reported)? You then figure out that the talks must have been much more meaningful. But that is not for publication. What good is this to us, if we are not to be told why they met?

And where are the crime statistics promised so long ago?

Has the curtain been lifted, even if only slightly, from the "black economy"?

Why has specific information on the spread of alcoholism in society disappeared from the press?

What is the current status of the advancing pollution of the natural environment, the end of major cities' growth, and the revival of the countryside?

How are "attendance figures" at theaters and movie theaters evolving?

What is being done about the spread of allergies and mental deficiency among the growing generation?

What changes have occurred in the emerging process of depopulation?

There are endless questions to be asked, and instead of answers we get the "deliberate silence" so familiar from the past, the hypocritical image of Brezhnevshchina.

To continue. Do we need censorship? Just look at it! If an author writes and if an editor misses something chauvinist, pornographic, or slanderous, some deliberately false rumors apt to spread panic among the population, if a state or military secret has been revealed (and the limits of such secrets are specified in a special list)—then the author must be held responsible and the law must be applied with the utmost severity to prevent others from doing the same. This is all the censorship we need.

But what do we do? And quite often too—we "shave" texts, each according to his own taste and applying the principle: in case something goes wrong. And on top of that there are secrets.

And now about something else. Out of the several hundred articles I have published in 35 years, only a handful remained in more or less their original form. A good 99.9 percent of them were truncated, castrated, and deformed by editorial scissors to the point where they hardly had anything in common with the original manuscript. And my tribulations as an author are no exception.

The funniest thing is that I have no complaints at all against the editors. Why should I—they are the ones in the firing line. According to our primitive customs, anyone you like can be held responsible for a manuscript—an editor, an editorial office chief, a chief editor—but least of all the author. So it is back to the Middle Ages: Executioner, do your duty! Consequently, you feel ashamed to read many published items. You unwittingly become an accomplice in social hypocrisy, guilty of the spread of Brezhnevshchina, and at times you prefer to keep silent.

But now the times have changed, and the tunes have also changed. Surprising as it might seem, you start coming across editors who not only raise the problem of making a statement but also help to sharpen it, putting to shame an author who, by force of habit, is exceptionally diligent in the self-censorship he has developed over the decades and, out of inertia, writes "in conformity with baseness," as M.Ye. Saltykov-Shchedrin taught. It is unheard of: Instead of being the eternal foe, the editor turns into the author's collaborator, treating him as an equal! God grant that this kind of swallow does make a summer.

I only had to mention self-censorship, and I could feel it gripping my throat now that it is time to move on to the third component of social hypocrisy—systematic lies. More examples than we need stare us in the eye. Open up almost any holy scripture at random—be it on philosophy, on history, on political economy, or on sociology. Be it from the distant or the not so distant past.

Actually, I would imagine that any reader would be able to produce just as many examples. Maybe someone bolder will help the author in his old age, with his hands paralyzed, his legs shaking, and his throat drying up when he has to stand up and say: What are you doing, comrades, acting in such a highhanded manner? Do you take us for fools, or what?...

So far we have managed to think up just one thing: to cancel the school examinations in history and social sciences, being ashamed before our own children!

There was a parable about lies for the purpose of salvation. It meant lying so as not to distress a worthy person, for example, not to poison the last moments of his life. The direct opposite can be said about our lies: lies for the purpose of perdition. Feckless. Disgraceful. Suicidal.

And the sooner we get rid of this aspect of Brezhnevshchina, the better.

Social freeloading is today being replaced by the "three S's": self-financing, self-capitalization, self-management. Social servility is doomed to perish in the process of society's debureaucratization. Social hypocrisy, together with dogmatic demagoguery, is being squeezed out by the new thinking based on the realities of today's world.

Brezhnevshchina is increasingly losing ground, but it is still floundering about, hindering our advance, threatening to suck us back in.

Are there any specific proposals as to how we can more swiftly leave it behind?

Investigation Concluded on Brezhnev Son-in-Law

PM3006105988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Single Edition p 4

[Interview with A.F. Katusev, USSR deputy prosecutor general and state justice adviser first class, by P. Timofeyev: "Investigation Completed"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA]

[Text] Yu.M. Churbanov became USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs after rapidly climbing, in just a few years, to the top rungs of the official ladder. The press has already written of his "doings" in this post. On 14 January last year Churbanov was arrested on a charge of systematic bribe taking. For nearly a year the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigation group carried out a scrupulous investigation. We asked A.F. Katusev, USSR deputy prosecutor general and state justice adviser first class, to comment on its results.

"A large group of investigators from all ends of the country was recruited. After the investigation had been completed Churbanov was given the opportunity to familiarize himself with the materials of the criminal case. He took 6 months, undoubtedly a long time, to do this. The case has been sent to the USSR Supreme Court."

[Timofeyev] Aleksandr Filippovich, readers are interested in whether other workers of the internal affairs organs, those who gave Churbanov bribes, have had criminal charges brought against them. Can you give their names?

[Katusev] On trial with Churbanov will be Kh.Kh. Yakhyayev, Uzbek SSR minister of internal affairs; the republic's deputy ministers T.Kh. Kakhramanov and P.B. Begelman; S.Z. Sabirov, chief of the Khorezm Oblispolkom internal affairs administration; Kh. Narburdayev, chief of the Kashka-Darya Oblispolkom internal affairs administration; D.D. Dzhamalov, chief of the Tashkent Oblispolkom internal affairs administration; Ya. Makhamadzhanov, chief of the Namangan Oblispolkom internal affairs administration; and M.S. Norov, chief of the Bukhara Oblispolkom internal affairs administration. All, naturally, no longer hold these posts.

Two officials whose involvement in the case was proved during the preliminary investigation, anticipating their arrest, committed suicide.

Any crime causes a chain reaction. He who gives a bribe robs his subordinates and they in turn also get money from other people's pockets.... So we have now picked up the main link but only one link.

There is still a lot of work ahead and the USSR Prosecutor's Office is continuing the investigation.

[Timofeyev] Has the loss caused to society by the criminal group been rectified?

[Katusev] In part, yes. As for Churbanov, the illicitly obtained money was not returned to him during the course of the investigation.

In conclusion I want to emphasize that the investigation into Churbanov's case has been completed, it is now up to the USSR Supreme Court. It alone can wind up the case and determine the degree of culpability of the accused.

Prosecutor Ponders Immediate Tasks of Justice

PM2806163188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with General Prosecutor A. Sukharev by IZVESTIYA observer Yu. Feofanov: "First: As Regards Legality"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Feofanov] The title takes words from Lenin's memorandum to People's Commissar for Justice Kurskiy in regard to a complaint. Lenin requests an answer "as regards legality, and only then to the point." You will surely agree, Aleksandr Yakovlevich, that this question alone, addressed to justice, reflects the crux of legality control by the procuracy. Inasmuch as this is connected with legality, the 19th party conference will surely not overlook such an important problem. But is the prosecutor guided unswervingly by this principle in his day-to-day supervisory activity? Let us right away rule out instances where the prosecutor deliberately flouts his duty and acts to curry favor with local and departmental

authorities. This is essentially no prosecutor. I am speaking of something else: have not considerations of economic necessity, the so-called "interests of society" and so forth, been predominant hitherto in the actions of legality control by the procuracy? That is, how would you assess the very system of procuracy thinking at the present transitional stage?

[Sukharev] The prosecutor is not immune from the interests of society. On the other hand, it is only under the conditions of perestroyka that they are beginning to acquire their true value. Our Achilles' heel lies elsewhere. We were programmed for decades and admonished as regards prohibitiveness and service of command methods of control. At times the law has been underpinned by both a departmental enactment and even a one-time "instruction from the top." The social essence of law was emasculated. And then ensued serious consequences, which we are now rooting out: legal errors, unlawful arrests and the broad interpretation of rules of prohibition. I refer if only to "embezzlement to the benefit of third parties." The bulk of the errors was perpetrated in respect to just these cases. In terms of the law it was all correct, seemingly: private-enterprise activity, figure padding, abuse of office. In practice, however, much of what was "perpetrated" proved to be what we now call socialist enterprise and without which normal economic and managerial life is altogether inconceivable. And, furthermore, mark you, granted the abundance of laws, the most necessary of them were lacking, seemingly. It is no accident that we associate perestroyka with the passage of such fundamental enactments as laws governing the state enterprise, joint labor, and individual labor activity.

Therefore if we are speaking of procuracy thinking at the present transitional stage, we have to mold it on the basis of the new socioeconomic realities. We cannot make an artificial separation: here the economy, and there justice, the law. Only do not think that I am advocating the primacy of expediency over legality. No! I advocate an interpretation of this complex problem with regard for objective regularities, which have frequently been ignored.

[Feofanov] I believe that if we are speaking of perestroyka in the field of law, it is most difficult introducing in practice, in life itself, the principle borne out in the Theses: what is not prohibited by law is permitted. This legal axiom is as old as the hills, but officially it has been proclaimed with us comparatively recently. And, it seems to me, everyone has become confused in the face of this evident fact. Even ordinary citizens, who are "not liable for anything." The question "Is this allowed?" constitutes a stereotype of our consciousness. But the prosecutor must remove all the barriers impeding realization of this principle. Is legality control ready for this?

[Sukharev] Control is, of course, not yet ready for this. Wherever would it begin if the very "what is not prohibited is permitted" principle were not impregnated by scientific thought and if there were no mechanism for its realization? The main thing now is to open up the parentheses in this highly promising formula. I will enlarge. In the period of the country's revolutionary renovation it is essential that we have a new vision of legality control by the procuracy in its Leninist interpretation of Lenin's ideas and concepts of socialist legality as a universal value of our society. Many scholars are still reiterating what has long been known and quoting Vladimir Ilich, but revealing his ideas with reference to the present pivotal stage of the building of state and law. There was enough said about the further strengthening of legality in the stagnation period. The time has now come to strengthen it in practice. And what is important here is a clear understanding of the place and role of all components of the social and legal mechanism in our life.

I would like to express one, from my viewpoint, important consideration. We have virtually nothing to say about the creative role of law but discern in it rather inhibiting, overwhelming regulation. What is needed here is an abrupt change both in science and in practice: a break with the idea that the prosecutor only does what prohibits, locks up, prevents, and so on. It is hard to look for a renovation of control with such a backward view. Of course, there have to be prohibitions, warnings, and punishments. But priority needs to be given to the surmounting of sluggishness and bureaucratism and the formation of new, prudent managerial risk. This is a big inner break for the mentality of prosecutor personnel. A concept of legality control by the procuracy which is unusual, but which emanates from life, seemingly, can, if you will, be clearly traced here: taking the creative role of law as the starting point, designing an optimum model of control, authorizing, I would say, and not prohibitive.

[Feofanov] Let us assume that the prosecutors reorganize themselves and get rid of the stereotypes of, excuse the expression, accusatorial thinking. But do they have sufficient effective means to put a stop to lawlessness at the root? When it creeps out from a departmental set of instructions, an illegitimate order and arbitrary actions of the authorities? About 4 years ago I wrote an article entitled "Citizen Lavrentyev in the Neutral Zone." This citizen, a foreman in a boiler house, had been dismissed illegally; but inasmuch as his position came under the notorious Lists, he could obtain no defense in court. He appealed to the prosecutor. And there ensued years of controversy between the entire system of legality control by the procuracy, including the prosecutor general, and the then Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry. The prosecutors lodged a protest against the order, but the ministry shelved the protests. But what is the result, Aleksandr Yakovlevich: the prosecutor has tremendous authority over the citizen and is absolutely powerless in the face of a department or an ispolkom?

[Sukharev] This is not quite the case. Last year the prosecutor's office lodged protests against more than 70,000 illegal acts on the part of the administrative

authorities and made 170,000 submissions concerning the elimination of breaches of legality, and in the vast majority of cases all the necessary measures were adopted. Furthermore, 220,000 actions were brought against officials totaling R260 million, and 100,000 citizens' complaints of their rights having been violated were satisfied. I would put it this way: procuracy authority, particularly with regard for the new powers accorded it last year, is perfectly sufficient for eliminating breaches of legality. How the prosecutor makes use of his authority is another matter. I will say plainly: very timidly at times, and occasionally in the wrong quarter.

This is our anguish. Unfortunately, there are many instances of the prosecutors themselves having "grown into" local and departmental preference and having become so accustomed to this situation that they have lost an understanding of their role. And this position, as we now know, helped implant illegality and formed "closed," corrupt zones in which scandalous abuses and crimes were perpetrated for years. Consequently, the problem of personnel and its scrupulousness and independence becomes of paramount importance. Real prerequisites are now being created for the molding of a new type of prosecutor personnel, but the burden of the past is still heavy, and an end has by no means been put to "telephone" law and attempts to apply pressure on the prosecutors. Nor have pliable, obliging prosecutors who are themselves not averse to availing themselves of the favor of "city governors" become extinct. We will not tolerate this.

[Feofanov] The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th party conference posed the question of the creation of the law-based socialist state. The prosecutor's appeal to the court for the legal assessment of an enactment of an executive body would, it seems to me, be an effective means of curbing administrative willfulness. In a word, it is a question of a constitutional court.

[Sukharev] Yes, much has been said recently about a separation of powers, about constitutional court supervision with reference to overseas and about trial by jury. The idea itself is attractive, but many misgivings arise, naturally. As is known, the classical theory of the separation of powers, which is now predominant in current scholarly commentary, was born long since, and the political democracy of bourgeois society is based thereon. By the time October had matured, Lenin was concluding: not a parliamentary republic, he emphasized in June 1917, a return to it from the SRD would be a step backward, but a republic of soviets...

It is always useful to take into account foreign experience, in the legal field included, but without, as they say, losing touch with one's own sinful soil. This is not, believe me, the position of a conformist. I simply cannot accept haste and facile judgment on a very serious problem. The first, albeit hesitant, steps of perestroyka are already beginning to bear fruit. The workforce has proceeded to the election of management executives, for example. As far as I know, no one has yet been elected a Rockefeller or Ford in the West. Consequently, we are feeling our way toward our own model in the sphere of production democracy. And why in legal life should our imagination not go further than borrowings from outside?

[Feofanov] Many lawyers have a different view of the separation of powers and the constitutional court. This surely testifies to an absence of theory. Well then, "how does the prosecutor sees it," consequently? On the one hand this is a confession, so to speak. But on the other, if this is taken seriously, does it not seem to you that legality control is confronted with an unduly broad, boundless task? In the "In the USSR Prosecutor's Office" newspaper, reports very often concern purely economic issues: the safekeeping of socialist property at the Volga Auto Works, being economical in fuel and lubricants, and so on and so forth. But I have somehow not read reports concerning the restoration of a citizen's rights, or about protests being lodged against a departmental enactment infringing on people's legitimate rights. It is essentially only now, in the period of perestroyka and democratization, that we have begun in earnest and not with slogans to talk about actual support for citizens' rights. This was also emphasized in the Theses. I can guess your position in principle. But practical program?

[Sukharev] You are right. In the stagnation period priorities were confused, and the "line" of the defense of citizens' rights came to weaken noticeably. Now the situation is changing, but not as quickly as we might wish. To speak of the prosecutor's office's practical action program, it is very extensive.

In judicial proceedings, in the pretrial investigation phase, we shall make more assertive use of all legitimate means to impede legal nihilism and subjectivism, encouraging the officials who display scrupulousness and support in practice the "presumption of innocence" principle. In Novosibirsk Oblast, for example, 13 persons have been exonerated and in eight cases the prosecutors declined to press charges in cases that were heard in which prosecutors were involved.

But this is just one aspect, the individual's social comfort depends on many factors of his existence. Take questions of ecology. In some cities you cannot breathe, water storage areas are becoming polluted, and enterprise waste exceeds all reasonable standards. Are we not in combating this evil defending human rights? And the restoration of labor rights?

We are creating a law-based state, and the role of legality control is becoming a most important factor of the strengthening of legality. It must assume an all-embracing, deeply echeloned nature, but as yet whole areas of social legal relationships are not covered by supervisory authority. Take, for example, our unobtrusive consumer service. People are given a hard time when it

comes to purchasing goods and having repairs done. But not only is there with us not virtually legality control but also there is essentially no legal base. The exchange, for example, of television receivers, radios, and other intricate home appliances is made difficult by departmental rules.

But even where there seemingly is legislation, actually employing it to protect rights is a very complicated business. How many complaints there are, for example, of abuses in the allocation of living space and in the sphere of medical services. It is at times not the law that is operating here but the subjective discretion and, at times, cupidity of the official. Clearly, leaving everything to him to farm out means condemning the citizen to hopeless single combat with departmental bureaucratism. Of course, it is essential to see the framework of legality control, it should not substitute for the administrative authorities, legal services, and inspection authorities. Some executives are not now averse to shifting their concerns onto the prosecutor and forcing him to be the fixer of contractual supplies, the supply of freight cars, the shipment of raw material, and so forth. It is our job to really enhance officials' responsibility and ensure order and legality and influence on the economy and social sphere via the stimulation of the entire legal mechanism.

[Feofanov] However, you will never escape the criminal sphere. We all rejoice in the fact that a "miracle" has occurred: there have come to be acquittals. But this is a normal phenomenon—a gratifying phenomenon, although it follows, of course, that this affords no particular pleasure.

[Sukharev] Here also the prosecutor's office has to work in a new mode. Because the weaknesses of investigation are obvious, we have not yet managed to extirpate the accusatory bias, just as, incidentally, we have been unable to avoid evaluating the work of the prosecutor's office depending on the state of crime. This has to be mentioned because this also is a bridge connecting today's practice with the times of stagnation.

For what should the prosecutor be responsible in the first instance? For legality in the process of criminal proceedings. It is here that a strict system of supervision at all stages should be introduced: the institution of criminal proceedings, the bringing of charges, the sending of a case for trial, and verification of the legality of judgments. It is at these stages that the prosecutor must emphatically cut short any deviations from the law and proceed from the requirements of the presumption of innocence. And we fully support the proposals concerning the extended participation of the defense in the pretrial investigation. We attach much to judicial and legal reform.

Nonetheless, the main thing is the personnel's mentality. Whenever we encounter lawlessness and the accusatory bias, what we see most often is a prosecutor or investigating magistrate, hoping for professional gain, being guided by wrongly understood social interest. "What, an inveterate embezzler, and he is to be let go?" "He has only just come out, he has a whole raft of serious crimes behind him...." Stereotypes. The competence, professionalism, will and, at times, honesty to overcome them are lacking as yet. Much is taken at face value: confessions, self-incrimination, surrenders—they are enough for some prosecutors. The chronic ailment—procedural nihilism: here a tiny deviation from the law, here a closing of the eyes to a seemingly "petty" misdemeanor, reliance on intuition, but all together—the road to arbitrary judgment. Legality is the lawyer's professional creed and basic inner essence.

In a word, under the conditions of the legal reform we are cultivating a concept of legality control oriented toward a qualitatively new approach to protection of the rights and dignity of the individual. We are as yet far from this goal. Take, for example, the administrative practice of the internal affairs authorities, the local soviet ispolkoms and ministries and departments. In terms of many points this practice is "ownerless," and supervision is lacking altogether. Yet administrative practice affects the interests of millions of citizens. There are many complaints about the actions of the State Automobile Inspection and the ID system. And the position of victims and so-called witnesses for the prosecution? Instances of threats against them which go unpunished have become more frequent recently. You can imagine what effect this has on people's general state and on justice itself even.

[Feofanov] Let us return, Aleksandr Yakovlevich, to the "economic activity" of the prosecutor's office, only at a different level. Perestroyka has summoned into being cooperatives, leasing and other contracts, and individual labor activity. "At the top" all this is being welcomed and supported, "from below" it is frequently being given an almost hostile reception. The laws have been enacted. But many of them abound in commonplaces and are prolix, and some points, on the other hand, are not very precise. This is appreciably undermining the "what is not prohibited is permitted" principle. This applies not only to the economy. Demonstrations, meetings, the "freedom of speech" concept—all this is either entirely unregulated by law or provisional rules requiring additional work have been adopted. An ideal all-embracing law is hard to imagine, life is, for all that, richer. Criminal law provides for a humane rule in this connection: the accused getting the benefit of the doubt. Could this postulate be carried over into the spheres of state and social life?

[Sukharev] In principle I agree with you: all vagaries that arise in various life situations, whether they concern citizens' economic, political or other rights, should be resolved democratically. But let us think. In the press and at various forums masters of literature and art are now saying a great deal about the culture of dialogue and

about democracy, and for some reason questions of the direct connection between a broadening of democracy and the growth of legal culture are simply not heard.

Let's face it, some democratic institutions with us are not only being revived but are being conceived; they are in the process of coming into being. They could be undone at root, while others, outwardly alluring, could be given the go-ahead to the detriment of both society and the citizens themselves. Understanding the real aims and possibilities of the renovation process and knowing how to distinguish between manifestations of democracy and anarchic ambitions—this is the task. Permissiveness, in whatever revolutionary phrases it is concealed, inevitably means a disregard for legality and, consequently, is in practice contra-indicative to perestroyka. However they may don the garb of democrats and restructurers, people inciting national discord, say, are the enemies of democratization.

We are building a law-based socialist state and are putting at the center of attention the well-being and freedom of the individual. The state must provide them with legal assurances. But only society itself can mold the moral and legal climate. Dissipation, egotism, self-seeking—these are the antipodes of perestroyka. The interests of others cannot be forgotten in the aspiration to greater personal freedom. When we speak of the vagaries in the law and cui bono in the interpretation of its missing spots and how to make use of the renovation which has begun, we simply need to ask: in the name of what and whom is this being done: the demonstration being held, the movement created and the debate initiated? If Moscow's residents believed, for example, that in the name of the "freedom of the individual" rockers could with impunity waken the citizens at night with the roar of motorbikes and create tens and hundreds of accident situations, well then, the law enforcement authorities would have to wash their hands of it. But I would hope that common sense would prevail.

Very closely connected with this is the question of glasnost. As far as the prosecutor's office is concerned, we have covered just the first stage of glasnost, which was to a certain extent imposed on us by the mass media. But glasnost in the law enforcement authorities must proceed from within and become a professional component of law enforcement activity. The people must know the legal laboratory, our prosecutor's kitchen and its discoveries, losses and mistakes. Yes, in our business any mistake is very sensitive and dangerous. But they are still there and cannot, probably, be completely precluded. This is not an expectation of indulgence, but life's truth, albeit bitter. It is entirely a question of the sources of the mistakes and violations and standpoints if they have occurred. We are currently giving much thought to how to throw open the doors of the prosecutor's office in order that the truth and realistic self-evaluation become the moral requirement of everyone. There is just one weapon: glasnost and self-purification. If we fail to achieve this, people will not completely believe us and will not understand the complexity of our work, grueling experiences, and sleepless nights. The glossing over of any blunder evokes suspicion and, consequently, mistrust.

I do not have to show, I believe, how important the position of the press is here. We have, incidentally, long been cooperating pretty well. The whirlwind of criticism of the prosecutor's office was protracted and stinging, but illuminating also, and many people feel uncomfortable from it even now. But we must not look for leniency. It would even be harmful. In expanding glasnost and incorporating millions of working people in this process it is important, however, not to be deflected into slander and the one-sidedness of complaints. It is important to remember that Truth and the Law are supreme. Legality and discipline are common and indivisible and should permeate the entire fabric of perestroyka and capture by their influence every individual. Correct emphases, the responsibility of the printed word—these also are a component of the new legal edifice. Many prosecutors and investigating magistrates performed their duty honestly in the stagnation period also, incidentally.

In this connection I have to call attention to the facile way in which some journalists are maintaining that the lawlessness of the 1930's and present infringements of the law are of the same nature. I have no intention here of downplaying or whitewashing today's transgressions. They are impermissible. But equating programmed lawlessness and the errors and, perhaps, abuses even of individual officials means substituting for the truth and evading an analysis of today's real defects and a search for real ways of overcoming them.

[Feofanov] Indeed, the problems are not simple either for lawyers or journalists. You have only just embarked, Aleksandr Yakovlevich, on your difficult duties of prosecutor general. I would like to wish you success in your work on strengthening socialist legality.

Account of Briefing Held on Stalin's Legacy

LD2606223488 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 26 Jun 88

[Passages within quotation marks are recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Announcer] A briefing on the theme: What Heritage Do We Decline? has been held in Moscow recently. Our reporter has brought us this account.

[Reporter] Those who addressed the journalists were people with a high public rating in the Soviet Union. At least this is how they were introduced by the briefing's host, Yuriy Kozakov of the NOVOSTI press agency. He declared that the purity and loftiness of plans and ideals had prevented us until recently from touching upon the subject of the grim Stalin times. People are afraid to lose support and faith, he said, but it's the need to have a firm support and a firm faith that makes us return to that period. The public repentance should become a stimulus

for our further advance. But to repent means to accomplish only the first part of the task. The second, and even more important, is to build a road leading to the future. Our society today is living through a kind of spiritual enlightenment. Lev Voznesenskiy, one of the most popular political observers in the Soviet Union, came up with the following opinion:

[Voznesenskiy] "It is not the figure of Stalinists that is so important for us today, it is much more important to study the mechanism that had led to the emergence of the system that we today referm to as Stalinism. We should do this so that nothing of the kind can ever happen again."

[Reporter] Says Lev Voznesenskiy. Leading Soviet journalist Yuriy Koryakin was more sharp in his assessment:

[Koryakin] "I disagree with my colleague. Without making any agreement on this score here we demonstrate the pluralism of opinions. Let's see how important Stalin's qualities were. The mechanism of the system of Stalinism was built that the leader's vices used to spread in a geometrical proportion all over the country. Naturally here the question arises about the role that outstanding individuals play in history. It's true that there are general laws governing society's development and its the people who make history in the long run but this is correct in relation to relatively long periods of time when the subjective influence of one personality is balanced by the influence of another. But the shorter the period the more obvious is the imprint that it bears of a certain leader. Lenin also passed through a certain evolution in his assessment of the role played in history by individuals. In his political testament he weighed extremely carefully personal traits of possible leaders of the revolution.

"I can compare this process with missile launching—the slightest deviation from the course may pass unnoticed during the blastoff but with the gaining of altitude the wrong track becomes obvious."

[Reporter] In the opinion of Yuriy Koryakin the negligent attitude to personal qualities was manifested in the long run in the dramatically negligent attitude to people as such. Stalin's reprisals of the thirties were largely the reflection of such an attitude. Yuriy Koryakin expressed further the (?importance) for the people to know their leaders better. He pointed out that one could not help but notice the distinctive tone of Mikhail Gorbachev's talk with intellectuals. He was the first to find that only correct language of advice, of attentive listening. Such a language, according to Lenin, should be devoid of any commanding notes. There can be no bossing around of either scientists, ordinary peasants, or artists. Only in this case can society exert its correctional influence on the government.

One of the questions asked at the briefing was the following: Is democracy possible under the one-party system? Replying to it, a leading legal expert, Dr Aleksandr (?Yakovlev) had this to say in part:

[(?Yakovlev)] "I think that under present conditions, the development of socialist democracy under the one-party system is a realistic idea. Though the Marxist teaching always admitted that the existence of a many-party system under socialism is not impossible, today it would be more expedient to concentrate on the development of pluralism of opinions within the party, rather than set up new parties. I think that this is a pragmatic approach that caters in an adequate and most productive way to current conditions."

[Reporter] Dr Aleksandr (?Yakovlev) further laid special emphasis on the need to ensure guarantees for the minority in the party. Such guarantees, he said, are an indispensable condition of democracy within party ranks. Leading economics expert Dr (?Zoltan Zanasev) spoke at the briefing about the opportunities of the one-party system:

[(?Zanasev)] "I'd like to stress that the opportunities of the many-party system in the Western countries are very limited. I think you'd agree that the difference between Gorbachev and Brezhnev is far greater than between Reagan and Carter, who belong to different parties. And this is within the one Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Lenin admitted the existence of different political platforms within the party. Platforms are not factions. Platforms are worked out openly while factions are formed secretly, and what is even more important, the latter act in keeping with the rules of internal discipline which lead eventually to a split. So we say yes to platforms, and no to factions."

[Reporter] Dr (?Zoltan Zanesev) said in conclusion: Journalists also ask cannot this basic revision of history undermine the juridical foundations of the Soviet state? Historical Dr Roy Medvedev gave this answer.

[Medvedev] "What we deal with is a very profound revision of history. With the passing of time it'll cover all events of the first years of Soviet government. But this revision can in no way undermine the juridical or actual foundation of the Soviet state. This state came into existence and will continue to exist. Many present-day states emerged following some revolution. The United States, Britain, or France are cases in point. Incidentally, in France one can come across the most critical assessments of Robespierre or Danton and of practically all the leading figures in the French revolution. Yet no one calls for the restoration of monarchy there, or the abolition of the republic. The same is happening in the United States. This only goes to show that the countries that have already gone through their evolution, like ou state for example, have matured to the extent that they can now criticize people and events that once laid the foundations for currently existing systems. As far as mistakes are

concerned, Engels used to say that during a revolution, more silly mistakes are made than at any other time. We are not going to idolize our revolution, and there is no need for us to be afraid of its objective analysis."

[Announcer] Said Dr Roy Medvedev. You've been listening to our reporter's account of the briefing held in Moscow.

Fears Voiced for 'Defeat' of Restructuring
PM2106105188 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 23, 5 Jun 88 pp 8-9

[Unattributed report on roundtable discussion: "What If Even This Perestroyka Fails?"; date and place not given—boldface passages as published]

[Text] Perestroyka has become a reality. It has been gaining in strength, depth and encompassing every sphere of Soviet society's life. Also a reality is the Soviet people's ever more effective support for the party's line towards renewal: promotion of democracy and glasnost, the people's self-management, radical economic reform, and society's moral purification. The coming 19th party conference is called upon to give a fresh impetus to the process of renewal and make it irreversible in earnest. The recently published "Theses of the CPSU Central Committee" provide a platform for discussion implying a real pluralism of opinions and an open comparison of ideas and interests. We hope that the readers of "MN" will take an active part in this discussion.

Taking part in the round table are: writers Yuriy Karyakin (Anchorman), Ales Adamovich and Boris Mozhayev, economist Gavriil Popov and philologist-pedagogue Lyudmila Saraskina.

This Is Our Last Chance [subhead]

Yuriy Karyakin: Let's just discuss one question and thoroughly: what will happen if even this perestroyka comes a cropper?

The current perestroyka movement is the **third** of its kind.

The **first** (NEP) [New Economic Policy] was started on Lenin's initiative—as early as March 1921. Its main outlines and the chief reference points of its programme were defined in Lenin's last works, in his political **testament** (incidentally, it already contained the word perestroyka, the meaning of which was close to what we understand by it today). This **testament** was criminally concealed from the party and the people.

As far as Lenin's programme of perestroyka as such is concerned, its socio-economic content (cooperative plan, democratization of the Party and the state, the national question, "changes in our political system"), it was first vulgarized and then generally cancelled by Stalin and his followers.

The **second** perestroyka started after Stalin's death and continued, with certain waverings and inconsistencies, until the mid-1960s. A revival of Stalinist practices engendered its quiet strangulation, which resulted in what was first designated as "stagnation" and now as "crisis".

And now we have the **third** perestroyka. Twice killed, it has been revived again in a bid to eradicate Stalinism once and for all, and to return to Leninist guidelines and principles, and their development. But this is our last historic chance, and it represents a cross section of our greatest hopes and apprehensions. Either it succeeds and we become a normally functioning socialist society with its own ever-stronger incentives for self-development, i.e., we either **find ourselves** finally, or **lose ourselves** completely, and watch our people and country, and our ideas suffer a catastrophic defeat.

Writing about a major specific feature of socialist revolutions, Marx said: They "criticize themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again, more gigantic, before them, recoil ever and anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their own aims, until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out:

"Hic Rhodus, hic salta! [Here is Rhodes, leap here!]

"Here is the rose, here dance!"

But history has made two amendments to Marx's uniformity.

First, socialism has found its main adversary in its own bureaucratic distortion. Stalinism, Maoism, Pol Potism and the like are all merely varieties of the latter which have brought more harm to socialism than all of its external enemies taken together.

Second, eradication of this distortion has proved to be a question bearing on the fate of socialism as such and, moreover, a question of life and death for the whole of humankind.

And here, let's add the feeling of national dignity, pride and honour among our country's peoples, threatened, besides everything else, with unheard-of lagging behind and unprecedented humiliation in the event of the demise of the the third perestroyka.

For this perestroyka to be really irreversible I believe we must first and foremost visualize soberly and fearlessly, what will happen in reality if it perishes. We must visualize and realize this in such a way that this path—

the path of retreat, failure, catastrophe—becomes patently **repugnant** to the whole of our society and therefore—closed, cut off, "interdicted".

Remembering the Future We Don't Want [subhead]

Ales Adamovich: When I imagine that **this** has already happened, I don't think about how unprecedentedly the shares of arms manufacturers will soar, or with what idiotic happiness the planners of megadeaths will rejoice, nor about how the numerous SDIS and ever-fresh programmes of collective suicide will spread their owlish wings with perfect ease over the planet. First and foremost, I think about Craig, about Cathy, about Robert, about American friends—our partners in the fight for a world wihtout wars—about Norwegians, French men and women, Germans, Japanese and people from other countries and nations who have come to believe in the reality, seriousness and irreversibility of our perestroyka—who believe in it avidly and with hope.

After all, they have projected their love for their own children, and their natural desire to live and survive, on us, their recent "enemies," having come to believe that all people, they and us, will be saved by perestroyka, by democratization of our society.

And again their trust will be intercepted by those whose task it is to create and apply "enemy images"—images that are more horrible than nuclear war. Again we'll be seen by the world as a country and system inexorably rolling downhill, sliding towards the condition and status of an underdeveloped nation, notably in the scientific and technological spheres, and thus the more desperately bristling up with multimegaton missiles.

And again we shall hear: better dead than subordinated.

And we, what shall we say in reply? Again: come to love us as we are—with Stalin and with this past of ours which is "still sacred" for us? Is it with this that those who have learned nothing are going to live and survive in the nuclear epoch?

Little by little some of them have been using, in their onw way, that very glasnost and democratic tolerance which so irritates them, in articles such as "Defensive Awareness and New Mentality" by A. Prokhanov in this year's May 6 edition of **LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA**. Its message was: We should prepare and train anew. Train for what?

We must push back into us what we have already ejected. We are persuaded to swallow it, if not with a happy countenance, then at least with a "patriotic" one.

Prokhanov's article and elan add up to the same old reaction to the new process, the same statement of "unshakeable principles" at a moment when they are under pressure from the new mentality in military affairs as well.

Why do you think we have to look after our "Afghan" veterans? The veterans, I would like to hope, of our last "small war." What lesson must we draw from the eight years in Afghanistan?

Those veterans, according to Prokhanov, must: "Be taken care of, nursed, fostered, surrounded with ideological and social concern"—Prokhanov puts it very well, but his humanism is by no means disinterested. "If the moment comes when it will be necessary to shed the blood-soaked sweat." "The state will be greatly in need of tried and tested people who are ready to sacrifice themselves."

But, as it seems to me, these wonderful boys—I have seen and heard them, and I have faith in the sanity of our future policy—will become not "deposited," not frozen "cannon fodder" for fresh "military solutions," but precisely the most authoritative voice against such solutions. And even more so—the mothers of those killed in this war. How many of them are there in our country—do we know this? The war is "small", but great is the maternal grief from its losses. Recently, I learned that one mother who received a zinc coffin "without a little window" in it, refused to believe what she had been told. Such is the way a mother's heart feels. At night someone helped her open the coffin: The body in it was not her son's (for God knows what reason: War is a great bureaucrat and confounder).

The horror of that night scene, the horror of the error, the horror of the mother's joy that it wasn't her child lying in the coffin (and equally great horror: Where had her son been sent if...?)—This is the true image of the "small war". and not the one which Prokhanov diligently, zealously modelled and still continues to model. Prokhanov theorizes: The Army and military hardware, becoming ever more sophisticated, will alone save the world and humanity, having been joined together. No longer: "Workers of all countries, unite!" And not: "All people are brothers!" But instead: "It may be a utopia, but I want to believe that when parity becomes an immutable all-penetrating idea, there will arise kind of superheadquarters standing above the armies and made up of them, and of us."

And this superheadquarters of the superarmy will control all and sundry, including SDI itself, and then will graciously disband itself and pass SDI into the hands of the UN....

And so confident is Prokhanov that a method of saving humankind has at last been found that he immediately sweeps every kind of "pacifist" with their movements and marches off the map of the planet. They only interfere with "their" and "our" headquarters—the dislike of the "pacifists", please note, has already doubled! Do you think the scientists, physicians and writers who organized something, who undertook something will be packed off with a parting, thank you? Or will it be remembered that, during the days of the signing of the

Washington treaty on the elimination of missiles, our country's leader named primarily the peace marches and the despicable intellectuals, and only afterwards the services of politicians and the military?...

All bureaucrats, military and civilian alike, ours and theirs, and notes for the same manners, their purpose being to push aside and switch off public opinion in order to retrieve their positions at all costs, even at the peril of life on earth....

And Being in Tune and History? [subhead]

Boris Mozhayev: I don't think the time will come when the media announce that perestroyka has been called off.

The point is not in the formal announcement of the repeal of perestroyka, but in what amounts to its actual sabotage. No one has publictly admitted being a saboteur, yet sabotage has seriously hampered perestroika for more than three years now. Consequently, the question must be how to combat the saboteurs of perestroyka. And then, who are they?

On the face of it, everything seems to be clear: The main saboteur is the bureaucratic appartus, especially at the middle level.

On the eve of May Day I visited a neighbouring region.

On April 30 I was met by machine operators in a field belonging to a state farm. The field was freshly ploughed, the furrows were covered with snow, the temperature—below zero.

"What drives you into the field in this weather?" I asked.

"Stupid bungling," they answered angrily.

"What sort of bungling?"

They gave me the name of the First Secretary of the Regional Party Committee.

"He sends us dispatches: when to plough, sow or plant, or else he comes himself, stamps his feet and cries...'Why don't you plant potatoes?' 'The soil is cold,' we reply. 'It's April,' And he: 'Have you forgotten how the party's assignment must be carried out? You received the order, didn't you? So fulfil it. I am responsible for the weather.' We planted 200 hectares out of the 300. Suddenly the temperature dropped to minus seven and it started snowing...."

"Is he the new secretary?"

"Yes, he replaced somebody.... He was sent from up there. They say he has managed to make a mess of a ministry. Now he has got down to us."

"You live a jolly good life!"

"Yeah! So jolly it could kill a horse."

Later I learned that the secretary of the District Party Committee had also been replaced. Beside himself with joy, he had ordered everyone on the state farm to report to work at 6 a.m., while he himself would inspect the state farms from the early morning to check whether everyone was in his or her proper place. Only after that does he go to the District Party Committee, to his own workplace. A young and vigorous man, he imitates the first secretary.... The latter has already dimissed those who didn't. He also introduced the regional radio roll calls still remembered from the 1950s. This means he allots the assignments himself by radio and then reprimands whom he deems it necessary, for everyone to hear. This is how the renewed cadres of the middle level coordinate work.

I am not speaking about the enemies of perestroyka, but about the strange udnerstanding representatives of the middle level have of perestroyka.

And how should we understand the fact that some three weeks after the 27th CPSU Congress, which unambiguously spoke about the need to observe the independence of farms, the plans for sown areas compiled in detail for the whole of the five-year period were actually imopsed on the regional leaders from above at an all-union conference? The two people who carried out this measure belong to something higher than the middle level.

But the subject under discussion—agriculture—is perhaps the most decisive factor capable of drastically raising the people's standard of living in a short time. Let us recall that Lenin's abolition of the surplus-appropriation system and the granting of full independence to peasants yielded an amazing result in only one year: After three years of famine we, in 1922, exported for the first time 52 million poods of grain and a year later—already 300 million poods. Those were real surpluses. It was they that made it possible to introduce convertible currency—the gold tchervonetz. And the prewar level of agricultural production had been reached by 1925. This circumstance enabled us to achieve the prewar level in industry as well by 1927. It is impermissible to minimize and hush up the successes of Lenin's New Economic Policy and cooperation.

High-ranking representatives of the bureaucratic class are extremely sensitive to the historical facts resulting from the ruinous dictatorship of the bureaucracy. It is they that call for leaving history alone, or at least for adopting a "coordinated approach" to the study of history. Needless to say, it is they, the bureaucrats, who will determine the "coordination" of studying, that is, up to which limits history should be studied. They forget Pushkin's words: "History belongs to the poet." How very much would the bureaucrat like to squeeze himself between history and the poet. Muzzling science, and art is the bureaucracy's habit, as old as the hills.

Let us remember that fatal role the bureaucrats—members of the State council—played during Alexander II's reform; it was they who insisted that a large part of the peasants' land should be left in the possession of the big landowners. And the tsar gave in.... This resulted in the impoverishment of the peasants on the one hand, and in unrestrained land speculation, on the other.

It took great pains to rectify this injustice at the beginning of this century by setting up peasant cooperatives, peasant banks and granting state-owned land to peasants on lease. As a result, "the value of our exports reached the colossal figure of nearly 1.5 billion roubles", "the excess of the cost of exports over that of imports equalled 521.4 million roubles in 1909". (P. Polezhayev, **During Six Years.** St. Petersburg, 1912). Besides this, at that time Russia produced about 4,000 poods of gold, and all of it went exclusively on domestic needs.

That is why Russia's industry and agriculture developed at such a rapid pace, outstripping American rates many times over, to say nothing of Germany, France, etc.

Indeed, technological progress can only rest firmly on land. This was well understood by Lenin, who resolutely abolished the surplus-appropriation system and war communism in 1921. It is also time for us to abolish surplus appropriation and fight with the same vigour as Lenin did against the protracted sabotage of perestroyka—deliberate or unintentional.

The positive programme advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 27th Congress and subsequent plenary meetings will only ensure the success of perestroyka when effect has been given to its basic principles: democratization of glasnost, real independence for plants, factories, state and collective farms, and full cost accounting. But for this there is a need first and foremost to restructure the system of management based on bureaucratically departmental interests, administrative planning, and on the jurisdiction of the State Committee for Supplies, which imposes its limits and funds on trade. In other words: There can be no independence of farms and enterprises under the State Planning Committee and the State Committee for Supplies, with all the departmental leapfrogging that they create. We must restore to the words "factories to the workers", "land to the tillers", "power to the Soviets" their true meaning.

We Know What Could Happen [subhead]

Gavriil Popov: If the administrative system of managing the economy survives, we know what could happen.

Sometimes an event occurs as a concentrated expression of the whole problem. The wife of my distant relative living in Belorussia was expecting her first child. During a check-up at the polychinic she showed signs of having radiation sickness. Then her husband began to show the same signs.

Was this accidental or inevitable?

It was supposed that radioactive food was the cause. Indeed, they had bought food products at the local market.

Why did the would-be mother take the risk? Didn't she realize? Of course, she did. But state shops had long stopped selling meat and vegetables. It has an abundance of one thing only—trusts, depots, departments, main government departments, etc.

But why did contaminated products appear on the market? No need to guess. Chernobyl accidental? We were assured that it was absolutely accidental. But, in his posthumously published notes, Academician Legasov quotes Nikolay Ryzhkov's words to the effect that the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station was not accidental, that our nuclear power engineering had been heading, inevitably, towards this grave outcome.

How can I believe in its fortuity if only recently I learned with horror that even today the trust, called upon to control atomic power stations, is full if incompetent workers? Because in the inspection groups are people who are no good elsewhere, people who have been dumped.

And now about another fortuity. Why wasn't the produce contaminated with radioactivity detected in time? It couldn't be more simple—if everyone had a counter and everyone—both seller and buyer—themselves controlled all the products.

From the newspapers I know about the disputes that have been going on for some time: Is it worth making your own counter? They argue about which design is better. Who is to make the counters? In short, there has been much paper and verbiage. What is lacking is effect. Is this again fortuitous? No, it isn't. Our interdepartmental traps are impenetrable not only where it concerns radioactivity counters, but for most kinds of modern technology. And it cannot be otherwise in an administrative system strictly broken down into departmental fields.

But what did the official control bodies do on the market? Do they actually exist? I suspect they do, and that they even had instructions and circulars. True, I am not sure whethere they have counters. If they do, I have even stronger doubts about their quality.

I can easily imagine the picture of control. Sellers come to the market as early as 5 a.m., but when will the control post open? And how long will the queue be? And will one controller have time to thoroughly check all boxes and baskets if he is hurried from all sides? Moreover it is not ruled out that, by sheer accident, the control post might not be working that day: They went to deliver the

quarterly report or attend a meeting of activists on perestroyka, or, that day it was that particular controller's turn to work on repairing a school.

These seem to be fortuitous, but they add up to form a strong chain containing all the ingredients of drama. But could anyone have prevented this or a similar drama under the existing system?

This is impossible without changes in the system—in the past, the present and the future. There is no procurator who will bring an action in the event of radiation sickness. On AIDS—all well and good. But if the state lurks in the capacity of a defendant—that won't do. After all, in all such cases it is the citizen that will be found quilty, but the state will be acquitted. It embodies the people. And the people is more important than the individual. Although it has long been clear to everyone that the people's interests are used to screen the interests of the state, and the latter—the interests of the bureaucratic apparatus which, in its bungling manner, administers the people's wealth on behalf of the people.

In short, under the present administrative system it is natural to suspect that my relatives may have caught radiation sickness, it's almost inevitable. More than that, under the existing administrative-command socio-economic system none of us has been insured against anything, either against the poor quality of vacuum cleaners, or against the violations of the procedure for sausage making, or against the passage of terrorists aboard aeroplanes, or against train collisions, or against fires aboard ships.

If the present administrative system is preserved, these kind of problems will only grow in number, because as one financier used to say a few centuries ago, the economic abyss is the only kind of abyss into which one can fall infinitely. But, for the 20th century, the view about the abyss being infinite is not correct. Will our people accept an ever-deteriorating standard of living, are they prepared to risk themselves and their children for the dubious privilege of seeing, as a leader, a decaying administrative system, and as their ideology—anti-Marxist concepts of bureaucratic socialism?

Educate a Free Personality [subhead]

Lyudmila Saraskina: What will the school lose if perestroyka comes a cropper? Nothing, at first glance. The school—this central unit in the educational system—has found itself unprepared to accept the ideas of perestroika and still remains the most conservative, politically backward and materially poor sector. the organizational leapfrog, started in the fourth (!) year of perestroyka, which eliminated three union ministries to please one committee—with the same people remaining in all key posts, with the preservation of the entire subordinate managerial structure, and with the captains of pedagogical science left totally frustrated—has so far created merely a semblance of changes for the benefit of the school, which now needs not reform, but revolutionary transformation.

Some 35 years ago, in the **Book for Narration and Reading for Children Under School Age**(Uchpedgiz, 1953), one could read:

We wrote to Stalin in the capital

About our high-rising wheat

And about what a bumper crop of rye we had

And about how good our collective farm was....

Better than all people in the world Stalin

Understands all that children write.

The name, which, it seemed, had been nailed into school manuals forever, whether the ABC book, geography or chemistry, vanished without a trace from their pages, having been ousted by other names and other idols. Among the textbook heroes were both "our Nikita Sergeyevich" and the "liberator of Little Land" Leonid Ilyich. Left in place, however, is the main negative element: complaisant readiness—at the first demand, signal or hint—to fill the vacancy of ideological-educative postulate of the epoch:

Better than all people in the world someone

Understands all that children write.

Pedagogical arrogance, smug self-assurance about the immutability of authoritarian education, and panic, even terror, at the idea of free thought and non-standard solutions weigh heavily on today's school. Pedagogics, based on dogma and interdiction, continue to rule the roost in the educational system. As before, six- to nine-year-olds draw from **Books for Reading** some foggy information about the enemies of the collective farm system, about wreckers arsonists, and about the Cheka men who conduct itnerrogations "wrathfully, contemptuously and in sangfroid". As before, the theme of love for the Motherland remains the most formal, semi-official, showy and spiritless in children's reading. As before, suffice it to look into the manuals of history and social science published in 1987-1988: the concept of the Soviet Union's development is predicated in the guidelines of **The Short Course**. And one has only to take a look at how schoolchildren "go through" foreign literature and foreign languages to understand that internationalist education is something that we lack completely.

So, if perestroyka is stifled or buried, public education as a system, alas, will not be threatened with anything; for the umpteenth time, it will get off scot free having suffered only a small fright.

And yet—I disagree with myself, because it is here, in the sphere of education, upbringing and enlightenment, that the defeat of perestroyka will bring about irreversible, catastrophic consequences. Turning back will finally discredit not separate political as is usually the case, but all ideas—Lenin's, Stalin's, Brezhnev's and modern: There is a limit to all ideological zigzags. With a stifled glasnost, the mechanism of survival, which worked on previous occasions will not bear the new superload. The toughening of policy, the tightening up of screws and the weeding out of dissent, no matter in what guise they may be carried out, will inevitably be taken up by the youth as the state's inability not only to feed and clothe the people, but even to find a common language with them. Life will acquire the shade of doom, and the younger generations will lose all hope for self-expression, self-vindication and self-improvement. The increase of normativeness in education, of dogmatism and hypocrisy in upbringing will inevitably lower the standard of education which has grown up in the atmosphere of reversible lies, will become a society of talkative idlers, passive cynics and infantile parasites obeying only the whip. Whatever positive motives there may be for study, work and creativity, they will lose their purport and meaning. Even material and career-oriented incentives will not be able to govern man—deprived of initiative and enterprise, submerged into dishonour, he will very soon deplete all the resources available to him for making headway.

The state gets the school which it wants to have. Its present state is by no means a fortuitous concurrence of circumstances, but a social order based on a bureaucratic system which, no matter how it may prevaricate, does not need a harmoniously developed personality difficult to manipulate. Demanding that the school provide "man power", the system doomed public education to many years of selection under which bellicose dullness and aggressive mediocrity occupied the key positions.

If our society takes the path of revolutionary change seriously and irreversibly, it will be able to formulate a new social order for the school—bring up a free individual with a broad and independent frame of mind and capable of intellectual quest and creative solutions. The fulfilment of such an order will call for decisive emancipation of the school and for the deliverance of public education from the rule of leading opinion, instruction and methodology.

We must give up orientation towards the "average" pupil, get rid of the single standard in educational establishments and curricula, secure the broadest differentiation in education and ensure everyone the democratic freedom to make a choice. We must give the teacher the possibility for professional and creative self-determination, and the pupil—real incentives for study, we must risk spending considerably more on the school than is being spent on it at present. These are the imperative tasks of our time. There is a need for absolutely honest, competent and highly professional communication of the ideas of perestroyka—that rapidly deployable social mechanism which will be able, effectively, impartially and, the main thing, loudly, to call things by their proper name.

Yuriy Karyakin: Some people will see this very approach, as "frightening", "alarmist" and even "apocalyptical". But it is precisely this mood and this guideline that have to be overcome and broken down. I am convinced that they contain the same old fear of seeing an abyss which is more frightening than the fear of stepping into it. What is actually meant, however, is that we should have the courage to see the abyss in order not to step into it.

Everyone thinks, speaks and writes: Is perestroyka irreversible or not? Well, let's be consistent to the end.

Solving the problem under the worst of all possible conditions amounts to both supreme objectivity and supreme businesslike courage.

Today, perestroyka needs the most sober and merciless rooting out of every self-deception, as well as honest and bold criticism of every self-delusion. Let people ask themselves whether they personally have done all within their means to make it irreversible? The more honest, courageous and merciless this answer will be, the greater will be the chances of this irreversibility.

Readers Concerned for Fate of Restructuring

PM2506160388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Commentary by Yuriy Orlik, IZVESTIYA deputy editor for the Letters Department, under the "Reading the Mail" rubric: "Addressed to the Conference"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] So much is expected of the upcoming conference that public opinion's dissatisfaction with its decisions—however radical they may be—is highly likely. We all are expecting miracles—but there are no miracles in politics. No one is going to lay out the magic tablecloth before us tomorrow with its infinite fund of dishes. And even a boon such as democracy cannot be given completely and forthwith. For this it is necessary, as a minimum, to change the existing sociopolitical structures, and you don't do that overnight. For this we ourselves must also learn a great deal.

It is necessary to have a clear picture of the legacy we inherited, in order not to yield to the temptation of easy changes. Here is a letter which has the tone of a bitter confession, which gives us the opportunity to peer into the soul of a person who was at the "intersection of the

epochs," a letter indicating that the resistance to restructuring, about which we will talk again, is built into us by the genes of the past. "I belong to the generation which was born and finished its schooling under Stalin," writes I. Konev from Gorkiy. "We had instilled in us allegiance, worship for the leader of all the peoples, and faith in his infallible genius. Then came the 20th congress, then voluntarism, then all talk and a semblance of action—stagnation. All this we know not from the press and television. All this passed, as it were, through our hands, hearts, and minds. This is within us. We were taught to expose the enemies of the people and to work hard. The start of the Khrushchev era was very promising, but clearly nothing was seen through to the end. Under Brezhnev we again began to praise Stalin, we gradually stopped working. Taking a little more, doing a little less. We praised the bosses, we toadied, we lied. And we won't be thrown out, or pushed aside, we won't pass away. We exist! I wonder, is this being taken into account in the restructuring plans—and how?" So we will not believe in miracles. We will be consistent and persistent in the pursuit of restructuring. This is difficult work.

It is natural that questions connected with the party's role and place in society, with the principles of party leadership of social life, are at the center of our readers' reflections. Readers are noting in particular that it is the CPSU and its highest leadership that acted as the initiators of the post-April changes. Although there is also another view which must be taken into account. "But what if Brezhnev or Chernenko had lived a little longer?" writes A. Kazarets, a lawyer, from Polonnoye in Khmelnitskiy Oblast. "You have to answer honestly: There wouldn't have been any restructuring. For many people it has come right out of the blue. Is this not why things are making such slow progress?" S. Plevako from Moscow, an Il-86 navigator and member of the CPSU since 1976, ponders this same theme. "The main thing right now is to create a political system which excludes the leader cult and asserts collegiality of management on a democratic basis." What we need are constitutional and statutory guarantees against a regime of personal power.

The path to this is outlined in the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the conference—direct secret elections to all posts in party committees with genuine competition (multiple candidacies), limiting the tenures of elective positions, accountability of upper levels to lower levels, of leadership to people.

A frequent topic of commentary in the letters is the notion contained in the Theses about the need to delineate the functions of party and soviet organs, to separate political leadership from state management, to redistribute power. Kiev's A. Babich believes that the excessive centralization of power is the root of all our troubles. "Sooner or later any monopoly brings about a crisis," he writes. "Even back during the birth and emergence of our state, a party-state bureaucracy began to take shape. It stood in the path of true democracy and self-management. Lenin could not fail to realize this. He hastened to caution us, he hastened to consider and implement a political reform. Its aim—to ensure for the people genuine and full participation in running the country, not merely formal participation in words only—as happened. His letter to the congress began with the words: 'I would greatly advise this congress to undertake a number of changes in our political system.' This is when restructuring was being pondered! If only fate had allowed Ilich a few more years...." Inspector N. Timoshenko of the "K.Ye. Voroshilov Turbomotornyy Zavod" Production Association (Sverdlovsk) explains the resistance to restructuring from a part of the party apparatus as "fear of losing one's position of power whereby everything—from the structure of the budget to the trimming of the poplars in the street—is the prerogative of the party organs." "It is not excluded that at the conference they will endeavor to uphold their chief privilege—the privilege of uncontrolled power" (V. Seitov, Frunze).

Many letters echo the appeal for greater openness in party life, the assertion of a spirit of party comradeship, and the abandonment of anonymity in political leadership. "Let us make the vote for the election of leading organs the only secret in the party," S. Varga from Tashkent remarks. "The rest must be removed from the secret list."

Readers also draw attention to the fact that the party and its leading organs contain many supporters of "semi-restructuring, semi-glasnost, and semi-justice" as A. Yurchenko, a worker from Lutsk, caustically remarks. "The fact that we now speak freely about everything that worries us is a healthy sign, the very foundation of democracy," A. Kayzerman writes from Donetsk. "But then along comes another series of changes in leading cadres (union republic central committee secretaries, obkom secretaries) and again we get the vague formulas 'in connection with retirement on pension on health grounds.' Something has suddenly and simultaneously undermined the health of many leading comrades. But we realize that they have simply failed to cope with their work, they have made a mess of it. So that is what should be written down. These merciful formulas are offensive to the people. Just as the cordon of policemen between the gorkoms and obkoms and the people is offensive. This is a throwback to the Stalin epoch when there loomed the artifically created fear of attacks and conspiracies." Along the same lines are the proposals "to register party organ officials in enterprise party organizations" (L. Sarychev, Ufa), and "to make public what party budget funds are spent on" (L. Chepygina, Saratov).

All these are particulars, as it were. What unites them is one thing: Readers link the success of restructuring directly with the democratization of the party itself.

The mail clearly registers the public anxiety over the fate of restructuring. Readers warn that the difficulties which its implementation is encountering can be utilized against the very idea of broad democratic transformations in the life of the party and country. "Many people are now criticizing the policy of glasnost and democratization," M. Bondarenko writes from Rostov-na-Donu.

"They refer here to the demonstrations by the Crimean Tatars, the disturbances in Alma-Ata, and the tragic events in Sumgait. No, dear comrades, all these problems accumulated during the stagnation period, while restructuring merely brought them out into the open...." And it is necessary to defend it against unfounded accusations behind which it is impossible not to see a hankering for order, for a firm hand, for the old times.

And although V. Sugonyayev, a doctor from Sevastopol, confidently declares, like hundreds of other readers: "We have waited too long for this restructuring and we will not give up its plans or its fruits to anyone," there is no cause for resting content. We do have something to lose. However critically we assess the last 3 years, the changes are obvious. New political and moral values are asserting themselves in the public consciousness, in life itself. We are talking about the need to establish a lawful socialist state. About the freedom of political debate. About real pluralism of opinions. About different forms of ownership. About the party within a system of other political institutions. About genuine freedom of conscience. About sovereignty in interethnic relations. About the dignity of the individual. About popular referenda and the real consideration of public opinion. About a dialogue between the country's political leadership and the people.

And therefore we must tirelessly defend restructuring. More than anything else, its opponents are counting on our fatigue, our lack of faith, our readiness to give up what we have planned. To put it precisely: If restructuring fails, this will be our defeat rather than their victory.

And I, like thousands of readers, would like the conference delegates to enter the Palace of Congresses 28 June with this very thought.

Militia Censured for Acts Against Demonstrators

PM2706123188 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 88 p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Following Up Our Articles": "'People in the Square'"—first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The Irkutsk Oblast Prosecutor's Office has checked the article "People in the Square" published 1 March this year in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. A. Pleshivtsev, Irkutsk Oblast prosecutor and senior counselor of justice, gave the following report to the editorial office:

It was established that on 9 January 1988 a group of citizens including V.B. Modonov, F.I. Oznobikhin and her daughter, A.G. Kostovskiy, and A.P. Sosunov marched with banners along Karl Libknekht Street in Irkutsk to the trade complex to collect signatures in defense of Lake Baykal. Militiamen led by Squad Commander A.L. Simonov stopped the group.

The militiamen explained that some of members of the group were asked to go by bus to the militia department for an investigation concerning their breaking the "Provisional Rules for Organizing and Conducting Meetings, Rallies, Street Processions, Demonstrations, and Other Events in Irkutsk."

The members of the group became angry, and they all got into the bus only after the intervention of Yu. A. Kostenev, deputy chief of the Internal Affairs Administration Public Order Administration, who drove up later. They were taken to the Kirov Rayon Internal Affairs Department in Irkutsk, where, after they were shown the "Provisional Rules..." and a protocol on the alleged administrative offense had been drawn up, they were allowed to go home. They were invited 16 January to a session of the Kirovskiy Rayispolkom administrative commission where the "Provisional Rules..." adopted by the gorispolkom were also explained to them. The use of violence against Modonov, Oznobikhin, Sosunov and Kostovskiy was not established.

At the same time, taking these citizens to the rayon department and drawing up protocols by militia personnel on administrative offenses were deemed illegal, since their actions do not constitute administrative offenses.

In this connection, the oblast prosecutor's office instructed Major General of the Militia I.D. Titarenko, chief of the Irkutsk Oblispolkom Internal Affairs Administration, to eliminate the revealed breaches of the law, and the question was raised of instituting disciplinary proceedings against Internal Affairs Administration workers A.L. Simonov and Yu.A. Kostenev and G.M. Kotov, chief of the Kirovskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department. V.A. Polyakov, chairman of the Kirovskiy Rayispolkom, was instructed to eliminate breaches of the law by the ispolkom administrative commission and the question was raised of the liability of the persons guilty of unjustly summoning the group of citizens to the administrative commission session.

According to the Irkutsk Agricultural Institute, the personal files of student Gorbunov and others participating in the movement to protect Baykal were not examined at the institute. As explanations made by N. Voronina, correspondent of SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH newspaper, indicate, no orders were issued to expel her or institute disciplinary proceedings against her for participating in the collection of signatures in defense of Baykal.

Professor Argues Need for Law on Demonstrations

PM2806150388 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Jun 88 p 2

[Interview with Professor V.Ye. Guliyev, sector chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law, by correspondent I. Beda under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "Lessons in Democracy"; date and place not given—first paragraph is TRUD introduction]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference say: "In adding the

concept 'legal' to the characterization of our state of the whole people, it should once again be emphasized that it is not only citizens who bear responsibility before the state but also the state that bears responsibility before citizens. It is obliged to show constant concern for strengthening the guarantees of Soviet people's rights and freedoms.... It concerns the creation of material and legal conditions for realizing constitutional freedoms (freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, freedom to hold rallies, street processions, and demonstrations, freedom of conscience, and others)." Our correspondent I. Beda met with Professor V.Ye. Guliyev, sector chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law, and asked him to describe some legal aspects of the problem.

[Beda] Vladimir Yevgenyevich, it is traditional in Soviet political culture and our democracy for the broadest strata of the population to take part in festive demonstrations. In recent years, however, there have been frequent demonstrations, meetings, and public rallies expressing disagreement with certain actions by local authorities and organs of management and putting forward certain demands regarding, for example, environmental problems, changes in the work and leisure system, and so forth. What is the attitude of legal science to this?

[Guliyev] If we take an unbiased view of the development of our country's democratic institutions in the period of restructuring and glasnost I believe that social activeness must be considered the norm. But for us of course the value of any form, including a democratic one, consists primarily in its content. Thus it is necessary to distinguish demonstrations of a constructively critical nature as an expression of public opinion and the social mood aimed at improving the state of affairs in a region, city, or rural locality, on the one hand, and, for instance, manifestations not so much of a critical character, which is normal, but of an openly negativist and antisocial character, when utterly unrealistic slogans are put forward that do not tally with the resources and potential. When a group of people tries to impose its opinions on the public at large and small groupings or even individuals try to inflame the population's passions and fuel negative emotions, addressing not so much reason as temporary, transient moods.

It must be said that until recently in our country there was an extremely guarded reaction to demonstrations not organized by the authorities or official social organizations. But because we are going through a schooling in democracy it is clearly necessary to view such things more calmly and above all to look at the existing law. It is common knowledge that Article 50 of the USSR Constitution guarantees Soviet citizens such political freedoms as the right of assembly, meetings, street processions, and demonstrations. You will find similar provisions in the constitutions of all union and autonomous republics. However, the legal regulation of the exercise of this right has clearly lagged behind.

Lawyers know that throughout last year decisions by a number of ispolkoms approved temporary rules for holding meetings, rallies, processions, and demonstrations. Of course, this can be regarded solely as a temporary measure. After all, it is inappropriate to resolve at the level of local organs problems regulating the exercise of one of Soviet citizens' basic political rights. This requires acts of the highest state authority: a USSR law or union republic laws. Incidentally, this is a generally accepted principle which is upheld by Soviet legal practice when the exercise of the citizen's constitutional rights and duties is regulated by acts of supreme legal force.

But because we still do not have any finished draft law or decree, let us turn to the temporary rules approved in a number of parts of the country. Their content is currently dominated by norms of a restrictive nature. They do not emphasize that rallies and demonstrations are a manifestation of socialist democracy or a form of expression of public opinion. They are also a manifestation of independence, civic activeness, and initiative on the part of Soviet people, their associations, collectives, organizations, and interested groups, a point that should also be made in the normative act. Only then should one discuss the kind of mass actions that are allowed and the cases in which they overstep the bounds of Soviet legality and become unacceptable and their organizers and participants should be held legally responsible for their actions and their antisocial consequences. The Soviet system is stable enough not to fear to talk out loud about the citizens' basic rights and freedoms.

Furthermore, it cannot be considered normal that these temporary rules are adopted not even by the local organs of state power—the soviets—themselves but by their ispolkoms. In view of the political significance of a local normative legal act of this kind it must be adopted by a soviet session itself, and after examination by deputies' standing commissions. There will only be some point to this, of course, when an act of state or republic significance comes into being.

[Beda] It would also be right for labor collectives to discuss the draft, wouldn't it?

[Guliyev] Of course. Perhaps it should be submitted for discussion by the population of the city, oblast, or other administrative-territorial unit.

[Beda] The Moscow Rules, adopted in August 1987, have still not been published in full in any publication, not even the Moscow city soviet bulletin...

[Guliyev] That, of course, is a mistake. You cannot act this way, the times have changed and so have we. There must be greater trust in Soviet people's political maturity and in the population of the city you are supposed to administer. Otherwise this not only undermines the social influence of these decisions, which are important

for residents, but also deliberately weakens the potential of state organs to impose punishments for violations of these temporary rules on those people who have transgressed their requirements.

[Beda] Does that mean that it is still necessary to regulate mass events in public places and to impose definite restrictions in society's interests?

[Guliyev] Of course. In any civilized society and in all human communal life there are restrictions on the exercise of certain of the citizen's rights and freedoms imposed by the social environment itself.

In this respect, too, our legislation corresponds to international human rights pacts because it sets valid limits on the exercise of political rights and freedoms. In particular, Article 39 of the USSR Constitution says: The exercise by citizens of their rights and freedoms must not be to the detriment of the interests of society or the state or infringe on the rights of other citizens. Here is what the international Pact on Civil and Political Rights (Article 21) says on this matter: The right to peaceful assemblies may be limited by the law in the interests of the security of the state or society, public order, the protection of the population's health and morality, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

It would not be inappropriate here to recall that Article 59 of the USSR Constitution says that the exercise of rights and freedoms is inseparable from the citizen's performance of his duties. The citizen of the USSR is obliged to observe the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws and to respect the rules of socialist communal life and to uphold with dignity the lofty title of citizen of the USSR.

In addition, Article 50 of the Constitution, which actually enshrines Soviet people's political rights and freedoms, reminds us that they are granted to the citizen in accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and to develop the socialist system.

If we are talking about the need for a special law, it is because it will provide an opportunity to observe both the interests of society and the state as a whole and the interests of the population of a given region, city, village, or collective. After all, it is well known that it is almost always a minority of the population of a given territory that takes part in even the largest demonstrations, rallies, and processions. I emphasize, as a rule, a minority.

That is why society's interests must be observed. No mass actions must upset the normal rhythm of work because another constitutional obligation of the citizen is conscientious labor for society's good. And the maintenance of public order, the observance of traffic regulations, and the protection of the natural environment, buildings, structures, and monuments are the responsibility of state organs and, in a number of cases, public organizations themselves. Therefore, irrespective of circumstances, demonstrators must remember that the expression of their demands, whatever they may be, must remain within the limits of legal procedures. Slogans, petitions, and appeals must not infringe on the foundations of the Soviet social and state system or the principles of Lenin's nationalities policy. They must not infringe on public order, upset the normal rhythm of production or any social labor at all, nor infringe on the rights and lawful interests of the people, society, or the population of the given territory as a whole or of the citizens living there.

Everything else must be examined calmly. Generally speaking, there can be no social process, still less a democratic process, without a show of people's emotions. We need people with an active civic stance. It seems to me that by no means all representatives of power fully appreciate that fact. But let us emphasize once more that emotions must be expressed in a civilized and cultured form. Consequently, encroachments upon the honor, dignity, and good name of other citizens or groups of the population and attacks of a nationalist or chauvinist nature are unacceptable.

[Beda] So, Vladimir Yevgenyevich, there must be either a republic or a union law on the procedure for holding mass rallies and demonstrations. But to the best of our knowledge the drafting of such a law was begun but later abandoned....

[Guliyev] Unfortunately, as far as I am aware, that is how things stand. I am convinced that the Ministry of Justice and other organizations involved in the process of preparing legislation must step up their efforts in that direction. The point is that the thoroughly progressive process of restructuring, by exposing chronic unsolved problems and at the same time expanding freedom, liberates people. Therefore, unexpected manifestations of civic activeness are also possible. It is necessary to be prepared for them, as it were, in terms of both content and procedure. In content, that is, by analyzing people's demands in a profound and benevolent way. And in terms of procedure, that is, by finding legal forms in which citizens' demands can and must be expressed. In brief, both sides—citizens and authorities—must overcome the shortage of political and legal culture. Then the **democracy of socialist pluralism** [boldface as published] will be established.

Weekly Comments on 'Democratic Union' Rally

PM2906091588 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 26, Jun 88 (Signed to Press 23 Jun 88) p 18

[A. Nikolayev article under the rubric "Glasnost Against Rumors": "Behind Gogol's Back"]

[Text] Life has often allowed me to meet very different people. Among them there have been people who, in expressing their own identity, never pause to think

whether this will be good for others. Thus it was a few days ago, on a hot June evening, that chance brought me into contact with the people who style themselves as "democrats."

A man wearing glasses strode up to the monument and took a quick look around. Barely pausing, he looked at the back of the bronze statue of Nikolay Vasilyevich [Gogol] in the avenue named for him and hastily pulled a piece of paper out of his pocket.

"Comrades! We have gathered here..."

A few passers-by stopped and started looking at those who were meant by "we"—indeed, the speaker was not alone. Two women, heads proudly held high, stood on each side of him, supporting this seemingly fit man by the elbows.

"Right, we members of the 'Democratic Union' (DU) have gathered here in order to..."—the speaker decided to repeat himself, stressing the word "democratic." But there was a slight hitch, so he had to start all over again. The point was that foreign television journalists, crowded together at the foot of the monument in anticipation of another sensation, moved so quickly in the speaker's direction that, underestimating the force of their charge, they almost threw him to the ground.

What was the man by the monument telling journalists and passersby who happened to be in Moscow's Gogol Avenue that June evening?

That "the DU is an opposition party with a factional structure. It can be joined by autonomous factions: Social democratic, liberal democratic, Christian democratic, national, and factional groups." At the same time, the speaker said, "no single party (including the CPSU) can be the leading and guiding force of society..."

"...It is therefore necessary," he went on, "to legislatively enshrine the right of citizens and organizations to agitate against the political system prevailing in the country."

The speaker continued to explain that the present system cannot ensure "a worthy life and worthy existence" (!?) and therefore all democratic organizations ought to rally not around the Communist Party but around the "Democratic Union," which is today setting the goal of changing the USSR's social system. (It appears, does it not, that the DU is nevertheless claiming a leading role?)

Suddenly there was a peal of laughter. And a few passersby went further, gesturing toward the speaker and saying: Where did they get ideas like that? It must be owed to family background.... Others grinned, shrugged their shoulders, and watched and listened with interest to find out what else he would "come up with."

The speaker, whom no one was preventing from speaking, suddenly puffed up his cheeks and shouted: "Today we are not allowed to speak, and tomorrow, when our words become dangerous, we will be shot at!" With that he ended his speech and gave the floor to his "colleagues."

They were not long in appearing. Getting up from nearby benches, they unfurled all sorts of banners ranging from "Freedom of Speech" to "We Demand Press Freedom!"

People of different ages. As for their views... As a matter of fact, it would be better to let them speak for themselves and say what they want. Especially since, dressing themselves as members of the union, they are so eager to give interviews to... foreign journalists.

"Our economic program," according to Valeriya Novodvorskaya, member of the DU Central Coordinating Council (whose political creed is known to many of our readers from Central Television's programs), "is economic pluralism... private ownership of the means of production. ...Our social program presupposes sharp wage increases...."

How is this to be funded? Through a sharp increase of labor productivity? After all, any schoolchild should know that this is the main source of growth of the people's prosperity.

"Funds to increase wages and boost expenditure on health services can be immediately found," according to Viktor K., member of the Central Coordinating Council, "if we cease arming the Army and financing the KGB."

And there is much more where all this came from. The USSR Armed Forces are to be replaced by a professional army (obviously, professionals do not need to be fed, clothed, and armed—author's note), while the KGB is to be immediately disbanded and replaced by "a new security service" (which, evidently, will also require no money to be spent on it. It is not for simple curiosity's sake that DU members demand (?!) "access to Cheka-KGB archives," in part to "supply full information and a list of KGB staffers' names to... international organizations").

"I have come from the Caucasus to tell U.S. journalists about the bad medical treatment I'm getting back home," Valentina Aleksandrovna V. butted in the conversation, adding that she was "very pleased to be in such a cultured company of young people."

Meanwhile the "cultured people" stood around, spitting and puffing on fragrant cigarettes while waiting for the foreign journalists to reload their television cameras.

"I approve of today's event," Gavril Timofeyevich D. joined in the conversation. "I'm not interested in the economic program. I'm more worried about something

else: At the age of 51, it is hard to be fired from work all the time. There's something wrong with my head. A few years ago I was found unfit to plead...." (he is out of a job at present).

One of the union's young members (17 years of age) hastened to the rescue of the ill-informed Gavril Timofeyevich:

"Wages will be higher. There will be decent housing and excellent health care," the robust youngster rapped out (according to his own admission, he is neither working nor studying).

The "rally's guest," as Kirill P. described himself (according to his own words, he has two previous convictions, one for possession of firearms), noted that he was not satisfied with the package of DU documents he had studied, if only because the union's economic program speaks vaguely about... the transition from one form of ownership to another, to private ownership.

He was backed by Mikhail K., former chief of the supply services in a sports school (at present also without work).

I approached one person, then another, and got standard answers: "I'm out of work at present," "I'm no longer in work."

"And what is the total membership of the DU?"

Nobody could say precisely, but there were claims that the DU Coordination Council apparently has several hundred people on its register.

What were DU members discussing among themselves while standing around the monument?

Brief sentences were exchanged on economics and foreign policy alike. They did this as though everything had long been perfectly clear to them. But as soon as a passerby approached, the conversation became much more detailed. The only point being that they repeated quite well known things.

For example, that it is necessary for enterprises to struggle against rush work, overtime, wage leveling, and "wage padding." They also said that the administrative methods of management are an obstacle to restructuring, and directive planning has taken the most pernicious form of proceeding "on the basis of what has been achieved." But the practice of planning "on the basis of what has been achieved" has already been condemned by everyone, just like the practice of rush work, which inflicts great damage to production. This has been repeatedly stated in party and government resolutions and is daily reported by the mass media. So why do we need the DU here?

The old pensioner standing next to me was confused: Had he turned up at a party meeting at the building operation board or what? And while he was standing there, looking in bewilderment at the strangers around him, the conversation abruptly turned in another direction. No sooner had the interlocutors from the DU turned to the need "to promote international agreements on the elimination of all types of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction" then it became apparent that, for this purpose, the USSR must... "unilaterally reduce conventional arms."

This, by the way, is nothing amazing. The DU members' attitude toward military duty is unambiguous: Let military service be performed by those who want to, or, to be more precise, by professionals. Perhaps in those circumstances the robust youngster who is only 17 years of age will want to serve the beloved fatherland in its professional army? But he shook his head and stood behind a little boy, handing him a banner reading "DU." What is all this?

Indeed: "If the infernal force wants to fool people, it will; by God, it will!" I recalled the classic's apt words. And it does seem as if it has fooled them, and in such a way that the DU members have moved toward it of their own accord. But is this an infernal force? Could it be simply an "overseas disease," a virus carried by the wind from over there, where they are still awaiting new "revelations" about trampled human rights in the Soviet Union? They obviously ended up with another "damp squib." They evidently expected a mass turnout, and all they got was a handful of people carrying banners. And the Western reporters were forced to shoot not a panoramic view of events but what is known as "closeups," switching the camera from one face to another.

Suddenly I heard someone nearby saying: "Look at that! They are demanding freedom while a militiaman is just standing there and smiling," a woman remarked to her friend.

And here you have another extreme that we were taught to accept for years. Apparently, if someone demands something he must be immediately detained, tied up, and bundled inside a van. But is there no other way?

We still see survivals of the period of personality cult and stagnation, when we were raised on fear on the one hand, and on universal complacency on the other. Intimidation and complacency were not just imposed but actually hammered into people's minds.

But times have changed. And now we must figure out what is what by ourselves. And people will figure it out. They will certainly figure it out. They have already started figuring out what the DU is.

...Meanwhile, the "colleagues" were probably waiting for someone to push somebody and for whistles and shouting to follow. They were waiting with microphones and

television cameras handy. They were obviously waiting for an unexpected turn of events, for a scandal. All they want is a "precooked" canard; preferably with the giblets removed, so they don't get their hands dirty. They will dress it themselves, they will launch it themselves. And the canard will take off....

But passers-by walked along the avenue as usual that day. They were walking back from work and, seeing the slogans and hearing the demands, some of them laughed while others just shrugged their shoulders. Some even stopped and joined in the debate.

How did the rally end? Even before it had ended, the foreign journalists drove off, leaving two of their colleagues behind, just in case. And the union members marched with their posters up to the "Kropotkinskaya" Metro Station and back. They stopped briefly by the militia station on the avenue. But the militia did not intervene. Nothing scandalous happened. But what actually happened here, behind Gogol's back? What happened and what is happening to those who, taking advantage of glasnost and democratization, are engaging in social demagoguery?

The organizers of such actions, who claim not to be indifferent to historical monuments, could hardly take the great writer's words as applying to them:

"I address those of you who have even the slightest idea about nobility of thought. I call on you to recall the duty that man must perform everywhere."

A duty that is inseparable from a sense of responsibility.

Economic

Gosplan Viewed as Obstructing New Initiatives

PM2806143788 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 24 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Balan: "Quiet Moves"]

[Text] There is a concept in chess known as a "quiet move." This is when one of the players makes an unobtrusive move. The aim of the maneuver is either to foil the other player's plans or to lay the ground for a formidable attack without arousing any suspicion. Oh, how bitter and annoyed a person feels after failing to see this quiet move that ultimately led to his defeat in the game—a game he had felt he could not lose.

I have not recalled this mystery of the old game by chance. Something similar is happening in the management of our economy. The draft Law on the State Enterprise (Association) was discussed with great animation quite recently. Only a few months have elapsed since this law was passed at a USSR Supreme Soviet session and already the central economic departments have made some "quiet moves"—arbitrary normatives, the "state order," and so forth—that essentially completely nullify the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

Unfortunately glasnost and democracy are still only stated principles in economic management. I will give you an example. Last September I proposed to S. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan, to use a new approach developed by a group of scientists to establish the normatives for budget payments. This approach envisaged the quantitative assessment of so-called "rent" factors. This would make it possible to create equally exacting normatives based on the different "startup" conditions of enterprises which took shape in the era of arbitrary administrative decisions. The new approach represents an instrument of glasnost in the economy allowing enterprises to discuss their management decisions with the ministry concerned on an equal basis and to defend their economic interests.

On 1 October I was summoned to the scientific section of the Commission for the Improvement of Management, Planning, and the Economic Mechanism. A Gosplan representative was there—V. Zverev, head of a subdepartment. Doctor of Economic Sciences N. Klimov and I explained the essential features of the proposed approach. The participants in the conference felt it was acceptable. On 12 October Academician A. Aganbegyan, chairman of the scientific section, told Sitaryan that he considered it feasible to agree with my proposals and ask the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work to organize the development of economic normatives in line with my proposed approach. Aganbegyan's reply also contained a proposal to set up a working group of specialists from scientific organizations and the USSR Gosplan to work out stable economic normatives for the 13th 5-year period. The authors of the new approach were promised that they would definitely be included in this group and involved in the discussion of the problem.

And what has happened? Nothing. The people from Gosplan have not kept their promise. It recently became known that Gosplan has drawn up a report on the basic principles for establishing economic normatives for the 13th 5-year period. It contains old proposals discredited by economic practice and takes no account of the proposals made by the authors of the new approach. The system of making deductions from profits is largely fiscal in nature (swelling the state treasury) and does not stimulate the solution of the important technical, economic, and social tasks facing the country.

I telephoned Gosplan. I was told that I should contact the USSR Council of Ministers. Well, the economic department of the USSR Council of Ministers has a report on our work from the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute, sent in February this year by Academician L. Abalkin. In particular, it supports our proposals to develop economic normatives using new methods. Until now, however, officials in the USSR

Council of Ministers have not shown any interest in our proposals or this letter, although some hope has appeared literally in the last few days. No, however much you would like it to be otherwise, there is no point in counting on some people chancing to be disposed toward or to pay attention to new approaches.

So why are these "quiet moves" possible in our country? Primarily because there is still no mechanism for the democratic discussion and adoption of management decisions important to the development of the economy. For example, decisions such as the one concerning payments into the budget from enterprises' profits should only be discussed and approved by the highest body of authority—the USSR Supreme Soviet. This procedure, incidentally, exists in all developed countries all over the world. Otherwise we will never be able to foresee the "quiet moves" which will essentially nullify all resolutions and laws, however apt they may be. With this kind of procedure, democracy will become true democracy—the legislative body will dictate the conditions as opposed to the executive body's imposing its decisions.

New Decree Still Taxes Cooperatives Too Much

PM2906142388 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jun 88 p 11

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences T. Koryagina, chief of a department of the USSR Gosplan NIZI [expansion unknown]: "The Mistake Must Not Be Repeated! Just 1 Month—June—Has Been Allowed for Thinking About the Form the Cooperative Tax Should Take"]

[Text] The sounds of battle and the fanfares have died away. The USSR Law on Cooperatives has been adopted and will come into force 1 July 1988. But my practically daily contacts with cooperative workers show that they are not particularly happy. Cooperative workers are tormented by doubts. Will there be an improvement in the situation regarding resource provision? How will things stand as regards premises? And, finally, taxes. Ill-starred taxes. What will happen to them? USSR Finance Minister B.I. Gostev provided an explanation. The decree on taxes (do you remember that on the eve of the session we wrote in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 17 May that its operation ought to be suspended?) was not approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet May session, was sent back, and is now being reworked.

According to one of the options, the scale of income tax must be as follows: up to R500—the same as throughout the national economy; between R501 and R1,000—R60.2 plus 25 percent of the sum in excess of R500; between R1,001 and R1,500—R185.2 plus 35 percent of the sum correspondingly in excess of R1,000; and, finally, R1,501 and above—R360.2 plus 50 percent of the sum in excess of R1,500. Thus, the monthly earnings of cooperative workers increase as follows: by R85 at R1,000, by R260 at R1,500, and by R860 at R3,000. As we see, big concessions have been made in the taxing of cooperative workers' private incomes.

In addition, it is proposed to take into consideration the fact that cooperative workers might be paid for their labor not monthly but, say, on the results of fulfilling contract work or once a year. In such cases cooperative workers receive the right to distribute the final income among the months according to the time actually worked and each worker's labor participation.

All this would be a great step forward compared with the former decree. It is of fundamental importance that it is necessary to back down under public pressure. An important victory has been won over departmental interests: It was, in point of fact, a matter of life or death for the cooperative movement.

What now?

According to our rough estimates, in order to make the domestic market fully active, the share of the cooperative and individual sectors of the economy must amount in the long term to 25-30 percent. This means that in 12-15 years they will have a turnover of more than R100 billion. That is the maximum task. But even if we speak of the minimum task, it is necessary to make a tremendous leap from today's "scale" of several hundred million rubles to tens of billions. Only then will the shadow economy yield its positions.

Will the decree on taxes "work" toward such a leap? I doubt it. The point is that, while sharply reducing taxes on the actual earnings of cooperative workers, it is proposed to increase them on the incomes of cooperatives as a whole. After subtracting expenses connected with acquiring raw materials, semimanufactures, and so forth (including dues of all kinds), it is proposed that the sum total of the cooperatives' residual economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] income will be subject to taxation at a 40 percent rate of income tax.

The arguments are these: Many cooperatives have become "rich," and their pace of development is high, so let them pay. The previous decree was based on the same "let," with the result that cooperative workers began to cut back production and their economic indicators "collapsed." So an increase in the tax burden could literally crush the emergent cooperative sector.

Finally, the tax policy is obliged to take into account the degree of the cooperatives' entrepreneurial risk. Whereas state enterprises' losses are covered out of the country's budget (or by redistributing profit within departments), cooperatives run the risk of bankruptcy. And here they must receive assistance from the state, which could be rendered precisely in the form of lenient taxation of their incomes.

A last point. A new law on taxation must not be adopted from 1 July 1988, that is, before a careful economic analysis has been made of the new cooperatives' work. Neither the USSR Ministry of Finance nor the USSR Gosplan can take account of all the numerous nuances in the organization of their activity. It is necessary to urgently organize a large-scale investigation in the spheres of the economy, finances, sociology, juridical science, and even, perhaps, the history of the cooperative movement. The mistake must not be repeated. That could ruin an important initiative on which so many hopes are now pinned.

Standards Committee Criticized Over Poor Quality

PM2906122188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. On Serious Shortcomings in the USSR State Standards Committee Leaders' Fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 'On Measures To Radically Improve Product Quality'"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee has examined the results of a check conducted jointly with the CPSU Central Committee Machine Building Department on the fulfillment by leaders of the USSR State Standards Committee and a number of machine building ministries of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 12 May 1986 "On Measures To Radically Improve Product Quality."

The decision adopted points out that the leaders of the USSR State Standards Committee (Chairman Comrade G.D. Kolmogorov, First Deputy Chairman Comrade B.N. Sokolov) are permitting serious shortcomings in the fulfillment of the said party and government resolution. The task advanced in it of strengthening the role and responsibility of the USSR State Standards Committee in implementing a unified state policy on questions of product quality is being resolved too slowly. The committee is failing to ensure proper coordination of the machine building ministries' activity in strengthening the role of standards in accelerating scientific and technical progress and achieving world standards for the quality of products being produced.

Concerted programs for the comprehensive standardization of the most important types of machine-building output, which are designed to ensure intersectoral coordination of indicators of quality and reliability and the high technical standard of newly created machines, as well as subassemblies and materials for them, are not being fully realized. With the connivance of the USSR State Standards Committee the leaders of a number of ministries frequently turn these programs into exclusively sectoral ones and do not include in them corresponding targets for subcontractors, with the result that the comprehensiveness and the targeted thrust of these programs are lost.

The sectoral administrations of the USSR State Standards Committee, its territorial organs, and state acceptance organs are exercising inadequate control over the introduction by enterprises and scientific research and planning and design organizations of promising standards in the development of new machine-building products and failing to check the observance of normative-technical documentation at the stage of the development and testing of models of new equipment. A mere one-third of machines are manufactured to standards that accord with world standards and involve the use of international standards.

Owing to lack of control by the USSR State Standards Committee Machine Building Administration (Chief Comrade L.L. Akinfiyev), such important national economic types of output as excavators, truck cranes, bulldozers, passenger buses, cars, and oil and gas extraction installations are still being manufactured by enterprises and accepted by USSR State Standards Committee organs according to obsolete speifications.

The Main Administration of State Acceptance of Output (Chief Comrade B.S. Migachev) and territorial organs of the USSR State Standards Committee are failing to exercise strict control over the introduction and observance of standards in the production of machine-building products. They do not utilize all the rights and opportunities accorded them to prevent and stop production of substandard output, they sometimes take a formal attitude to checks, they frequently tolerate many violations in the manufacture of output, and they allow it to be produced with deviations from standards. As a result, violations of standards and technological discipline occur at 60 percent of machine-building enterprises where there is no state acceptance system.

Substantial omissions in realizing the task set in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution of achieving world standards of product quality also result from the fact that the leaders of the USSR State Standards Committee are only slowly restructuring the work style and methods of the committee's apparatus. A close link has not been set up in the work of its territorial organs and state acceptance bodies.

The USSR State Standards Committee Party Committee (Secretary Comrade Ye.M. Ignatyev) exercises inadequate control over the activity of apparatus Communists in fulfilling party and government directives and fails to display proper exactingness toward cadres for restructuring their work style and methods in light of the new tasks entrusted to the committee of coordinating ministries' activities in questions of radically improving product quality.

The decision emphasizes that leaders of machine-building ministries, associations, and enterprises are failing to take proper measures to decisively improve product quality. Technological equipment is in a neglected state at many plants, the necessary diagnostic, testing, and measuring facilities are absent, and the activities of technical control services are not improving.

There is a particularly unfavorable situation as regards observance of state standards discipline at the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building where, out of 236 enterprises checked last year, 172 violated the standards' demands with regard to product quality; the corresponding figures for the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building are 74 enterprises out of 121, and for the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems 174 out of 274; 58 percent of all enterprises at the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry committed violations.

Leaders of ministries and the USSR State Standards Committee are tackling unsatisfactorily the creation of centers for conducting state tests of machinery and equipment to secure an objective assessment of their quality and reliability and accelerate the introduction of product certification in the country—which is holding up Soviet machinery exports.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee drew the attention of Comrade G.D. Kolmogorov, chairman of the USSR State Standards Committee, to the serious shortcomings that have occurred in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Measures To Radically Improve Product Quality."

Account was taken of his statement that the USSR State Standards Committee will adopt additional measures to actively implement a unified state policy in questions of product quality by means of systematically improving and introducing standards and bringing their demands up to the level of international ones, to strengthen leadership of and control over the activities of State Acceptance and territorial organs of State Supervision, and to prevent and resolutely stop production of substandard output.

For serious shortcomings in fulfilling party and government decisions on improving product quality in machine-building sectors and in coordinating the activities of the committee's administrations, Comrade B.N. Sokolov, CPSU member and first deputy chairman of the USSR State Standards Committee responsible for this area of work, was strictly cautioned.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee severely reprimanded Comrade L.L. Akinfiyev, CPSU member and chief of the USSR State Standards Committee Machine Building Administration, for serious shortcomings in work on introducing progressive standards and realizing programs for the comprehensive standardization of the most important machine-building products. The committee indicated to Comrade B.S. Migachev, CPSU member and chief of the Main Administration of State Acceptance of Output, the need to strengthen leadership of and control over the activities of bodies locally and to strive for high exactingness from them in assessing quality and for the adoption of timely measures to prevent and stop production of substandard output.

The attention of Comrade Ye.M. Ignatyev, secretary of the USSR State Standards Committee Party Committee, was drawn to the need to enhance the responsibility of Communists and all apparatus workers for the unconditional fulfillment of party and government decisions on decisively improving the technical standard and quality of machine-building output.

The materials of the check have been sent to ministers and party committees of ministries in the machine-building complex for examination and for measures to be taken to eliminate the shortcomings that have occurred in fulfilling the said CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution.

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Embark on Space Walk

To Repair X-Ray Telescope

LD3006084088 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Excerpt] Soviet Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have left the Mir orbital complex and embarked on a space walk. They will be repairing the X-ray telescope. [passage omitted]

Work Completed; Back Aboard

LD3006120888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1048 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Excerpts] The music program is being interrupted to switch over to our special correspondent Vladimir Bezyayev at the Flight Control Center:

[Bezyayev] Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have been in open space [words indistinct]. They have carried out very complex repairs. [passage omitted]

Well, the cosmonauts are back on board. [passage omitted]

Purpose of Walk Noted

LD3006113388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are working in open space today. Over to our special correspondent Vladimir Bezyayev at the Flight Control Center:

[Begin recording] [Bezyayev] The chief purpose of this EVA [extravehicular activity] is to replace the pickup of the TTM telescope, which is designed to provide pictures in the X-ray spectrum. The cosmonauts' work is being closely observed here at the Flight Control Center [FCC] by a group of Netherlands and British experts, who delivered this telescope.

The cosmonauts have already spent 3 hours, 27 minutes, and 52 seconds in space. Over this time span, they have pried open the vacuum screen heat insulation of the "Kvant" astrophysical module, reached the pickup unit, and at the moment are disassembling it. We can hear the cosmonauts' heavy breathing—the work in weightlessness is far from easy. Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have often repeated today: Give me a moment to rest. Perhaps the most difficult thing is fixing oneself to something in order to be able to work with both hands.

That is why the commander and the flight engineer take turns holding each other. The cosmonauts have already rested twice, but the experts at the FCC have been working without a break in order to suggest the right decision and offer counsel at any given moment.

A television communications session is now in progress, and we can see on the right-hand screen the cosmonauts and on the left-hand one their back-up crew on earth who repeat every one of Vladimir Titov's and Musa Manarov's movements in a hydropol at a module mock-up.

Now, I would like to present to you one of the experts who is here at the FCC. That is (Rashid Aliyevich Tyunyayev), scientific superviser of the Roentgen international orbital observatory at the Kvant module [name and title as received], corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Could you tell us, please (Rashid Aliyevich), why the boys went out to work in space?

[(Tyunyayev)] The TTM instrument has preformed excellently during the year of its operation aboard the station. That telescope enabled us to obtain unique X-ray band pictures of the Great Magellan Cloud Galaxy, the closest galaxy to us. A nova flared up last year in that galaxy. It is probably still fresh in everyone's memory. The work with that telescope received the recognition of experts throughout the world. Over the year of work, the telescope's pickup unit has decoded somewhat; consequently, the quality of its operation deteriorated. The Netherlands experts informed us that they had developed a new higher-quality pickup unit which is capable of operating 2-3 years in space.

Now our cosmonauts are replacing the pickup unit for this telescope. If everything goes well—and I will knock on wood here—what are we going to do further on? Tomorrow we will align the telescope using the well-known very bright source Cygnus Xl. The day after tomorrow, we will hopefully observe the Vulpecula nova in X-rays. The fact is that Kvant, our international observatory, has been very lucky again: A new bright object has appeared in the sky in the Vulpecula Constellation in X-rays, second in terms of brightness in the entire X-ray sky. Observations by Kvant have already made it possible to detect two components in its spectrum: one with the temperature of 20 million degrees, and the second one—which is amazing, nothing like that existed before—with the temperature of 1.5 billion degrees. This is a major result of Kvant at present, which is followed by all astronomers of the world.

We hope that now—first of all, it is most likely a black hole—we believe, and we hope that the telescope, if everything goes well, will be in a position to help us to prove that, indeed, this X-radiation originates from the same place where recently both a source of radio frequency emission flared up and a new visible star emerged. That is very important, and people around the world are now hanging on for news of that. We do need the telescope very badly at the moment.

[Bezyayev] (Rashid Aliyevich), judging from the reports from orbit, the most difficult stage is over—we have heard this estimate. Further on, work will be easier. The work in open space is continuing. [end recording]

'Mir' Cosmonauts' Week of Research Described

LD2606192488 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 26 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—TASS correspondent Vlarimir Isachenkov writes:

This week Soviet Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov, who have been on board the orbital complex Mir for more than six months now, were getting ready for a space walk. They are to work on one of radio telescopes with a view to improving its characteristics and increasing its service length.

On Friday the cosmonauts checked the equipment of the station's transfer compartment which is used before egress as an air-lock chamber, and reactivated space suits.

During medical experiments Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov estimated the condition of muscles which get little load in zero gravitiy, and recorded the characteristics of the cardiovascular system during physical exercises.

Under the extra-atmospheric astronomy program the cosmonauts conducted research with the use of the Roentgen orbital observatory which is part of the equipment of the Kvant research model. The cosmonauts continued to study the evolution of the radiation spectrum of the super-nova in the Large Magellanic Cloud.

Three satellites were orbited in the USSR last week: The Cosmos-1,954, the Cosmos-1,955 and the Cosmos-1,956. They carry scientific equipment intended for a continuation of space research.

Soviet, Bulgarian Cosmonauts' Success Recognized

Gromyko Presents Medals

PM2806151388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 88 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "For Heroism in Space"]

[Excerpts] On 24 June in the Kremlin, A.A. Gromyko presented USSR state awards to the Soviet and Bulgarian cosmonauts who took part in the joint international flight to near-earth space.

Hero of the Soviet Union USSR Pilot Cosmonaut A.Ya. Solovev and Hero of the Soviet Union A.P. Aleksandrov, Bulgarian citizen and researcher cosmonaut, were awarded the "Gold Star" and the Order of Lenin for successfully completing the space flight on board the "Mir" orbital research complex and for their bravery and heroism there; twice Hero of the Soviet Union USSR Pilot Cosmonaut V.P. Savinykh was awarded the Order of Lenin. Bulgarian Researcher Cosmonaut K.M. Stoyanov received the Order of the Peoples' Friendship for active participation in the backup work for the Soviet-Bulgarian crew's space flight aboard the "Mir" orbital research complex.

In his speech conferring the awards, A.A. Gromyko stated:

Dear Comrades!

Today we are honoring the heroes of the second Soviet-Bulgarian space flight Anatoliy Yakovlevich Solovev, Viktor Petrovich Savinykh, and Aleksandr Panayotov Aleksandrov, who together with Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov on board the "Mir" orbital complex fulfilled a complex and varied program of scientific research and experiments. We also honor standby Researcher Cosmonaut Krasimir Mikhaylov Stoyanov, who took an active part in backup work for the Soviet-Bulgarian flight.

Nowadays, when cosmonautics is developing so rapidly, each flight requires from each participant a broad outlook, knowledge, true vocational skill, courage, will, exertion, and purposefulness. All these qualities were vividly demonstrated by Comrades Solovev, Savinykh, and Aleksandrov.

The second joint Soviet-Bulgarian flight was conducted in the interests of enriching our countries' fundamental sciences and economies.

You, good comrades, spent 10 days in space together with those who are still in orbit now. Those days were short and long at the same time: short in comparison with other space flights and, at the same time, long because you had the most packed program of all the previous international trips into orbit.

This program was prepared by scientists from the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. It incorporated a large range of medical-biological, technological, geophysical, and astrophysical experiments.

There is no doubt that the research data obtained as a result of your work in space will constitute a considerable contribution to both countries' science and economy and will serve to further develop world cosmonautics.

I would like to draw attention to... the following detail, also: In the course of the preparations for this flight, Bulgaria's scientists manufactured many state-of-the-art instruments and appliances. The three cosmonauts have returned to earth but the Bulgarian instruments have remained aboard the "Mir" station. Soviet Cosmonauts Titov and Manarov are continuing to carry out studies using them. So, figuratively speaking, the Soviet-Bulgarian space watch is still under way.

The program for joint scientific studies was implemented under the "Shipka" project. Historically, the name of this mountain pass was a symbol of the brotherhood in arms between our two countries. It is now the name of the program for fraternal Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space. The entire joint flight is also new proof of our fraternity.

The two peoples—Soviet and Bulgarian—led by the CPSU and the BCP are implementing profound revolutionary transformations. We take pride in the friendship between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. We have talked about this on many occasions. It is also appropriate to stress this idea today. The friendship between our peoples, the roots of which go back into hoary antiquity, which has been reinforced by blood and has undergone rigorous tests in the joint struggle for freedom and independence, notably during the years of World War II, is a firm basis for close cooperation between our two countries in the struggle for peace and social progress.

It gives me great satisfaction today on the eve of a great historic event in our country—the 19th all-union party conference—to congratulate you on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government on the successul fulfillment of the flight program and the award of the Soviet Union's highest state decorations. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, sends you cordial congratulations.

I wish you good fortune and new great successes in your noble work.

A.A. Gromyko's speech was greeted with applause.

The award winners made answering speeches of thanks to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government. [passage omitted]

The following took part in the presentation the awards: P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; K.A. Kerimov, chairman of a State Commission; and Georgi Pankov, Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR.

News Conference Held

LD2706221788 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A news conference was held today on the results of the Soviet-Bulgarian space flight. The leaders of the flight and the Cosmonaut Training Center, scientists and doctors answered journalists' questions. Anatoliy Solovev, commander of the Soviet-Bulgarian crew, emphasized that the program had been accomplished in full, and talked about how the flight had gone, and about the joint work by the two crews on board the Mir station. Bulgarian Cosmonaut Aleksandur Aleksandrov shared his impressions on the implementation of the Soviet-Bulgarian Shipka scientific program. Flight Engineer Viktor Savinykh dwelt in detail upon the work of the apparatus developed for the flight by Bulgarian specialists. The experiments which the Soviet-Bulgarian crew began in orbit will be continued.

Journalists' questions at the news conference related not only to the results of the Soviet-Bulgarian flight, for this is only one part of the extensive space research program. Aleksandr Ivanovich Dunayev, head of Glavkosmos, spoke about the most immediate prospects in this direction:

[Begin Dunayev recording] This year is a year of international cooperation. This is how it can be described for our country: The Soviet-Bulgarian flight has taken place; then, as it known, a flight by an Afghan-Soviet crew is planned for August: 29 August. Further, you are already aware that between 21 November and 21 December there will be a flight by a long-stay Soviet-French crew. We plan literally in a couple of days, as you know, on 7 and 12 July, to launch spacecraft to Phobos, Mars' satellite, for comprehensive research in which 13 countries are taking part, together with the European Space Agency. Preparations are continuing for a shuttle spacecraft. Until we are sure and have carried out the whole cycle of experiments, until we are sure that there are no extraordinary circumstances connected with it, we shall not venture a launch. [end recording] [video shows Aleksandrov, Savinykh, Solovev; A.I. Grigoryev, A.A. Leonov, A.I. Dunayev and other unidentified people on panel]

Military

Yazov Book on Military History Reviewed

PM2906122788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jun 88 First Edition p 2

[Colonel General V. Karpov book review: "The Fatherland's Sons"]

[Text] Our country's heroic past, the history of the selfless struggle for its freedom and independence, and today's USSR Armed Forces are the main contents of the book "True to the Fatherland" by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, published by the Military Literature Publishing House. (Footnote) (D.T. Yazov, "True to the Fatherland" [Verny Otchizne], Military Literature Publishing House, 1988, 352 pages, price R1.60)

More than 1,000 years—from the times when our ancestors defended their native land from nomad incursions to the present day—this is the book's timeframe. It covers a significant part of our fatherland's history. Noting its enormous role in molding a person's life stance and cultivating patriotic and international feelings and the qualities of builder and defender of the new society, the author stresses the need for a solicitous attitude to history in general and to military history in particular. He also stresses the importance of a responsible and most objective approach to elucidating the past. "I am convinced," D.T. Yazov writes, "that one-sidedness, the deliberate overemphasizing of some facts and silence about others, the extraction of certain events from life's canvas, and the unscrupulous or simply self-interested interpretation of them are not permissible here."

The author's position determines the general tone of the book and is the key to the coverage of historical facts and interpretation of the deep sources of the wonderful character traits of the Soviet people and their soldiers. These traits were revealed most fully and clearly at crucial stages in history, during periods of grim military ordeals, of which our country has had quite a few.

Factual, documentary, and archive material is widely used in the book. This lends particular weight to what one might call the author's professional view of the events of the past—the view of a military man who knows not just by hearsay what war means and how much sweat and blood from soldiers and immensely heavy work by commanders is demanded by each battle. And his reflections on changeless, eternal values—love

for the motherland, honor, dignity, responsibility, heroism—and his clearly expressed civic spirit in the subtext of the entire book create an emotional mood which I think is bound to find a true and pure echo in the reader's heart.

The book's main hero is the fatherland's defender: soldier and marshal, ordinary soldier and commander, the person for whom nothing is dearer than the motherland's freedom and independence. For him nothing is more exalted than the sacred obligation to defend the motherland. In its entire content, the book shows the profound pattern that emerged on the brittle ice of Chudskoye Lake, at Kalka and Kulikovo, at Poltava, Izmail, and Borodino, at Kakhovka and Tsaritsyn, at Perekop and Volochayevka, at Moscow and Stalingrad—our motherland's defenders have invariably demonstrated staunchness, courage, and military skills which were superior to the enemy's in all the numerous engagements and battles against foreign invaders. Despite the fact that the heroes lived at different times and there were often hundreds of years between the feats they achieved, their indomitable spirit nourished and continues to nourish, above all, one feeling common to all generations. It is love for one's native land, one's fatherland.

The attitude to the motherland is a measure of all a person's qualities. It is impossible to imagine, the author says, either a good worker or a valiant soldier who lacks feeling for his motherland. The depth and strength of this feeling, he stresses, are measured not in words but in labor for the good, happiness, and power of one's native country, the reliable defense of its security, and the irreproachable, selfless performance of the specific work which each one of us is directed to do.

This is the key, main thought which runs through the entire book. The sense of patriotism, D.T. Yazov writes, was filled with special, incomparable force by the victory of October, when our country's working people gained their own genuine, socialist fatherland. A fundamentally new type of army was created for its defense. The book shows the objective necessity and vital importance of such defense, reveals Leninist principles of building the Soviet Armed Forces and teaching and educating personnel, and tells how new, socialist combat traditions, which absorbed all the best elements from the experience of the preceding generations of the fatherland's defenders, emerged in the battles against the White Guards and the interventionists.

One chapter of the book is devoted to the period which has gone down in our motherland's history as the interwar period. The development of the Armed Forces in this period was implemented on the firm foundation of socialist transformations, taking into account the increasing military threat from imperialism. Without glossing over the shortcomings and mistakes allowed to occur in the prewar years, the author also shows that it was precisely in these difficult years full of contradictions and difficulties and marked by the Soviet people's historic labor and military feats that firm foundations were laid for the future victory in the Great Patriotic War.

The book provides a broad panorama of the nationwide struggle against the fascist German invaders, the mass heroism of Soviet soldiers, and the skill of commanders and military leaders.

Basing himself on a wealth of factual material, the author demonstrates the dialectics of the struggle by the Soviet people and their Armed Forces against the aggressor and the organizing and leading role of the Communist Party, which united the country in a single military camp and headed the nationwide struggle. He analyzes the objective and subjective reasons for what was for our country a difficult development of events in the 1st 1 and ½ years of military actions, reveals how the breakthrough was achieved on the Soviet-German front during the Great Patriotic War and all of World War II, and shows the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union and our Armed Forces to routing Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan and achieving victory.

Today's servicemen—worthy heirs to the glory of all previous generations of defenders of the motherland—vigilantly guard the fruits of this great victory gained in the name of life and peace on earth. The author talks about military life's heroes and the internationalist servicemen with great warmth and reflects on the present shape of the USSR Armed Forces and their place and role in ensuring the Soviet people's creative labor, preventing war, and preserving peace. He devotes considerable attention to examining topical questions of international security and disarmament in light of the new political thinking and reveals the defensive orientation of the Soviet military doctrine and the need for a coordinated mutual reduction of the level of the existing military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The book discusses how Soviet servicemen are working with the entire people on implementing the program directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent party decisions, deepening restructuring in the Army and in the Navy, improving their skill, stepping up discipline, and stepping up unit and ship combat readiness. The author reflects on ways to improve military cadres' style and methods of work, on their responsibility for teaching and educating subordinates, on the authority of the commander and the political worker, and the foundations of their spiritual closeness to soldiers and sailors. He examines ways to intensify the teaching and educational process, notes the need to creatively utilize the great wealth of experience of the Great Patriotic War and increase the contribution of Soviet military science to resolving the theoretical and practical tasks of restructuring.

The modern soldier must know and be able to do a lot. When discussing this, the author notes that military service accelerates a young man's maturation and in addition makes great demands on him and his training. Military commissariats, schools, technical colleges, and vocational and technical schools have a great role to play in improving this training and young people's entire

military-patriotic education. The USSR DOSAAF, the Lenin Komsomol, literary and artistic figures, the mass media, veterans, and reservists are making a great contribution to it.

The defense of the motherland at all times and throughout the Soviet state's history has been and remains a nationwide concern, the book says. Everyone in his sector makes his contribution to ensuring this defense. And everyone must be aware of and feel his responsibility for its reliability, be ready to fulfill the oath of loyalty to the fatherland with dignity and honor, and when necessary fight to defend his native land's freedom and independence.

The book is addressed to a wide range of readers and is well illustrated. It will certainly be of great interest to people of different ages and professions, will greatly assist commanders, political workers, and military instructors, and will add to the arsenal of propagandists and everyone who participates in young people's military patriotic education. Full of great civic-mindedness and a spirit of patriotism and internationalism, it summons us to guard and increase the heroic traditions and teaches us to faithfully serve our people and to be ready for exploits in the name of the motherland.

Military Draft Dodging in Kirghizia Reported

PM2806092988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 88 First Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Kim "specially written for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "Failed To Arrive as Notified"]

[Text] Frunze—Personnel of the Kalininskiy Military Commissariat could not conceal their astonishment when they found out who had turned up for admission. After all, for 9 years draftee V. Yermolin had been avoiding army service, had changed his address and place of work, and had not come to the commissariat in response to registration notices. Now there he was. Apparently Yermolin had turned 27 and, according to existing regulations, he was ineligible for the draft on grounds of age. The aged draftee had turned up to obtain a military service card so that he would not be different from his contemporaries who had served in the forces.

No document was issued to Yermolin, of course, so he displayed enviable perseverance, knocking at various doors, demanding justice....

This is not the only instance of draft dodging. Over a period of 6 years A. Lipurov from the village of Alamedin failed to respond when summoned to the military commissariat. Several fruitless years have been spent hunting for A. Zhuzhlev and A. German from Moskovskiy Rayon and T. Alymkulov from the village of Chon-Aryk.

In 1987 military commissariats in Kirghizia handed over to the republic's prosecutor's offices 17 files on draft dodgers. But in none of the cases was criminal action taken.

The republic's internal affairs personnel are also failing to take the proper steps, not regarding failure to respond to a draft notice as a major crime.

It is estimated that over 30 state and public organizations participate in the military-patriotic education of young people in the republic. But none of them is carrying out its tasks to the full.

The results of a recent check in schools showed a formal approach to and fraudulent report of fulfillment of the standard requirements of Ready for Labor and the Defense of the USSR activities. Nearly one-half of the draftees failed to confirm grades of excellent and good given for physical education. Soldiers are joining the Army physically ill-prepared, unable either to swim or to shoot, while the State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport sounds off about opening new pools and indoor ranges.

It is a bewildering fact that in 1987, 2,030 young people in Kirghizia were not drafted because of some ailment, but the word is that there is no question at all of anything being physically wrong. No further comment needed, as it were....

Natives of Kirghizia have always been good soldiers, brave warriors. The republic is proud of the civil war heroes D. Esengeldiyev and T. Zhukeyev-Pudovkin. Ch. Tuleberdiyev and D. Asanaliyev gained immortality on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War and internationalist serviceman Yu. Islamov was made Hero of the Soviet Union posthumously.

The young soldiers of Kirghizia have to carry on their glorious work and heroic traditions. It is our common task to help them.

Akhromeyev, Others Sign Gorodetskiy Obituary

PM2806142988 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 88 First Edition p4

[Obituary of G.D. Gorodetskiy]

[Excerpts] Retired Lieutenant General Georgiy Dmitriyevich Gorodetskiy, former deputy chief of the Marshal of the Soviet Union R.Ya. Malinovskiy Military Academy of Armored Troops responsible for training and scientific work, died suddenly at the age of 66. [passage omitted]

[Signed] S.F. Akhromeyev, Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, S.I. Postnikov, D.A. Grinkevich, M.D. Popkov, V.M. Gordiyenko, P.D. Gudz, F.I. Voinov, P.V. Kurevin, and N.G. Orlov.